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On 20 March 2017, a group of filmmakers from MegalithomaniaUK followed an assembly of modern Druids and captured their Spring Equinox traditions at Stonehenge, performed in front of a gaggle of tourists, who seemed more interested in the demonstration than the original Neolithic builders. To a chorus of drums, the modern Druids marched into the center of the stone circle dressed in a hodgepodge collection of white robes, headdresses, hats, and capes, while a few walking sticks rounded out the image. As the procession ended, the head Druid invited witnesses’ participation. With the extension of this invitation, a plea for peace was made in each of the cardinal directions before singing the “Druidic Mantram of the West”\(^1\). This song represented the rising of the sun at the solstices and equinoxes as well as display one of the many “ancient” aspects of the religion\(^2\). With the completion of this “ancient” song, the head Druid gave a brief history of the druidic religion, known today as druidry. He explained Druids throughout history performed the song since 3000 BCE when the monument was first constructed\(^3\). The modern Druids then repeated stylized prayers to the earth, sky, and various natural aspects to ensure the earth healed from the failings of human nature. An inherent hope for peace and goodwill underscored this ceremony as the Druids implored the ley lines to provide comfort to innocents who had fallen victim to humanity’s failings\(^4\).

Overall, this forty-minute ceremony seemed like a step back into time for those interested in the mysterious culture of the ancient Druids, a civilization that has been

---
\(^2\) Ibid., 5:00-5:42.
\(^3\) Ibid., 7:16 – 7:23.
subsumed into popularized Celtic culture. Unfortunately, the connection of the ancient Druids and Stonehenge does not have the historical or archaeological backing this ceremony assumes. And yet, the connection continues to persist so the next question to as is, why? Where did this connection begin? Why are the druids so integrally linked to Stonehenge and England without overwhelming archaeological or historical evidence? An answer to these complex questions must start with the scholarly works of William Stukeley, an antiquarian who not only introduced Britain to the Druids and was a precursor to modern archaeology, but whose conclusions and methods created an academic landscape that fostered a sense of nationalism within British intellectual society. The history and popular imagery around Stonehenge offers a glimpse into his legacy because it is one of the most famous archaeological sites linked to England and one he studied in detail, creating conclusions that would outlast him. Today Stonehenge has become a symbol of the island and its preservation is a source of national pride5. But this was not always the case, the rise of English nationalism would solidify its connection to England but that took an overhaul of the study of antiquaries and a new explanation of English pre-history.

The evolution of nationalism served as an underlying framework for this paper. This is not because any of the main players were outwardly nationalist in the historic sense but because of the importance of unique history for nationalism and the charges in this period that would allow nationalism to flourish in the late years of William Stukeley’s life. Stukeley did not call himself a nationalist but his work would pave the way for intellectual nationalism to take root. The goals of this thesis are to trace the

---

changing nature of the narrative of English history through antiquarianism, the beginnings of English archaeology, and the rise of English nationalism in a transition period from 1724 to 1830. To that end, this thesis will begin with the earliest antiquarians and historians, specifically those who explored the chronology of England and English history, both of which used the Roman invasion as the lynchpin that established all later English culture. This will provide a baseline for early historiography and offer a comparison for the shifting trends that William Stukeley used his standing as an antiquarian to push. The evidence Stukeley brought to bear made him one of the earliest, and most significant, antiquarians to recognize Gerald Newman’s description of the necessary role of the artist-intellectual in the development of nationalism, because “In an especially intense way he is the first to feel the illness of his nation’s culture and to sense himself a lonely exile from its true sources”6. Stukeley was an empiricist and emphasized tangible British evidence and its importance to reconstructing English chronology. But he also saw the lack of English interest as an illness caused by ignorance of a coherent and factual national history. This reality seemed increasingly accurate when paired with descriptions of pre-Roman British culture, a concept that seemed impossible given the lack of culture attested to by antiquarians and historians. Stukeley broke from the early modern narrative and provided a lens to look into the pre-Roman world, which forced a critical look at many of the bedrock sources for antiquarian studies and, ultimately, laid the groundwork for the discipline of archaeology. This confluence of proto-archaeology and the language Stukeley relied on altered the narrative

of English history by turning the focus inward. It also provided a native framework for English origins, necessary for the evolution of English nationalism.\textsuperscript{7}

However, it is impossible to discuss this framework without also looking at the international undertones of his arguments and their connection to his focus on England. This is where Linda Colley’s arguments on the importance of an international opponent in the creation of a national identity discussed in \textit{Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837}, needs to be addressed. While Stukeley provided a way to solve the nationalistic weakness of Newman’s cosmopolitan intellectuals, England’s conflicts with other European nations had a significant role to play. Colley emphasized the role of international pressures on the creation of British identity with the conflicts between the French and the English as a main impetus\textsuperscript{8}, a key concern in Stukeley’s writings. But where Colley concentrated on the influence of international forces on solidifying English nationalism within the country, the benefit of exploring Stukeley’s contributions allows for an examination of how the pressure of competition affected the descriptions of English origins. Stukeley provided an English chronology not dependent on the continent, which allowed for an academic separation from the continent, an important step in the rise of nationalism, but neither Newman nor Colley specifically addressed the role of Stukeley. Stukeley’s published work was an argument for patriotism within the intellectual community, and a necessary step for the explosion of academic nationalism in the mid 1700s. Stukeley informed a transitory period in the rise of English nationalism but it is necessary to explore the original narrative and its writers to provide a starting baseline.

\textsuperscript{7} Ibid, 55.
CHAPTER 1

WHO WERE THE EARLY ANTIQUARIANS? AND WHAT DID THEY SAY ABOUT ENGLAND?

Antiquarians were products of what Newman called Cosmopolitanism, which was “…a sentiment uniting cultured minds’ down through the ages, one which in various ways touched thinkers as diverse as Zeno and Cicero and Marcus Aurelius, St. Augustine and Erasmus, Bacon and Montaigne, Voltaire and Alexander Pope⁹. In short, learning and education were more important than country allegiance for a small minority of the educated elite. For those who believed in the value of knowledge, it superseded questions of cultural difference and language barriers to unite all intellectuals. Cultural sophistication and learning were more valuable than regional or national connections, leaving those in the upper echelons of British society with more in common with those of the same position in France and the rest of Europe than with their national inferiors. This manifested itself in many ways; but the creation of the Grand Tour in the mid-1600s illustrated this European mentality. Young English gentlemen travelled to Europe to finish their educations, examining the classical remains of past cultures and learning the

⁹ Ibid, 1.
European languages of the continent. The Grand Tour was a physical manifestation of an affair the British had been having with the continent, the French specifically, since the Norman Conquest. Class, as opposed to national, divides were created, as G.M. Trevelyan noted when he wrote in the late nineteenth century, “…when the common people despised and hated everything French with a fierce ignorance and prejudice, our taste in letters, in architecture, and in house decoration was to an usual degree subjected to French and Italian ideas”\textsuperscript{10}. For those wealthy and influential enough, France was a political rival but ultimately an intellectual and social influence that could not, and in many opinions should not, be escaped. Newman augments Trevelyan’s point when he described this closeness,

> Anglo-French was the natural speech of the English upper classes into the fourteenth century, and in various forms, as in law and in the writing of law reports, it survived into the eighteenth. The royal motto and the formal royal assent and dissent on parliamentary bills came from the French. All English noble titles, even the word peerage itself, were taken from the French\textsuperscript{11}

Eventually, for the wealthy, influential, and learned, French and, to a lesser extent, Italian culture was more important than any force of British identity. This led to an identity much more European in its formation, an identity wholly unappealing to nationalist sentiment.

But, Newman and Trevelyan suggested these tendencies were older than the Grand Tour and had an influence in English intellectual history. For instance, one of William Camden’s major impetuses for writing Britannia in the 1580s demonstrated cosmopolitan interests, “The great Restorer of old Geography, Abraham Ortelius, thirty years ago, did very earnestly solicit me to acquaint the World with the ancient State of


\textsuperscript{11} Newman, 15.
Britain, that is, to restore Britain to Antiquity, and Antiquity to Britain …”\textsuperscript{12}. Plainly, Camden did not write his famous chronicle of Britain for the everyday Englishman, he wrote it in Latin for the learned, upper class peoples of Europe, although it was later published in English during his lifetime. Possibly, even more fitting than this motivation was that Abraham Ortelius was a Flemish cartographer who met Camden when he traveled to London in the mid-1500s. The pair maintained an intellectual relationship before Ortelius asked the young historian for an antiquarian explanation of Britain\textsuperscript{13}. Further, Camden seemed to be one of many Englishmen Ortelius maintained an intellectual connection with; his letters included correspondence with Richard Hakluyt, Thomas Penny, and Humphrey Llwyd\textsuperscript{14}. These English thinkers were well known members of intellectual society and the plethora of letters between them and demonstrated the international connections. Specifically however, Camden demonstrated the power of cosmopolitan influence in the early works of antiquarians, which drew them into the world of classical literature, a continuation of the Renaissance in Britain.

These antiquarians were an intermittent academic organization throughout English history. Starting in the fifteenth century, they founded and disbanded societies a few times but eventually the lasting organization of the Society of Antiquaries in London was informally founded in 1707 when Humfrey Wanley, John Talman, and John Bagford met at the Bear Tavern in London to discuss a variety of topics, including English antiquity. These informal meetings grew into a formal society as others learned of the meetings and by 1717, the discussions moved to the Mitre Tavern on Fleet Street and the

\textsuperscript{12} William Camden et al., Britannia (London, 1695), i.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.
Society elected as president, Peter le Neve; as director, John Talman; as treasurer, Samuel Gale; and as secretary, William Stukeley. From this point forward, there is a continuous record of the Society’s activities, culminating in the Royal Charter of 1751, which gave the Society the ability to enshrine its orders and regulations and become an official Society under the consent of King George II. From here, the Society recorded not only its own meetings and discussion but the researched into England’s ancient roots as well. Today, the society boasts around 3,000 Fellows whose occupations range from archaeologists to architectural historians, emulating the diversity of the original interests of the society founded in Bear Tavern three hundred and ten years ago. But this is not where the society actually got its start; there was an earlier group whose roster boasted the intellectual likes of Robert Cotton, John Doderidge, and William Camden, known as the College of Antiquaries. This was where the conversation began.

Sir Henry Spelman wrote the only extant explanation of this College in *The Occasion of this Discourse*. According to Spelman, the impetus for the first meeting was purely knowledge. It was started in 1572 when “…diverse Gentlemen in London, studious of Antiquities, fram’d themselves into a College of Society of Antiquaries, appointing to meet every Friday weekly in the Term at a place agreed of, and for Learning sake to confer upon some questions in that Faculty…”

---


17 Henry Spelman and Edmund Gibson. *The English works of Sir Henry Spelman Kt. published in his lifetime; together with his posthumous works, relating to the laws and antiquities of England; and the life of the author. To which are added, two more treatises of Sir Henry Spelman, never before printed: ... With a compleat index*. (London: Printed for D. Browne, sen. & jun. W. Mears, F. Clay; Fletcher Gyles; and T. Osborne, 1727), 69.
society was connected through loose ties to research and knowledge but it solidified as more intellectuals joined the conversation. Eventually, the College decided to meet at the Darby-House where they discussed a question posed the week prior. The response considered the most insightful or best written was published for posterity’s sake, however most of these responses were published as individual papers, not in a society journal or specific book which left them as pieces of research with no official sponsor.

These meetings continued for a few years until the majority of the members either died or moved into the countryside\(^\text{18}\) leaving the college to wither away until its revival in 1614. This new College bolstered its membership with politically connected men like Sir Robert Cotton; George Hackwell, the Queen’s solicitor; William Camden; and Sir John Doderidge, among others, but Spelman was careful to point out that given the connections of a number of the College’s members “matters of State nor of Religion”\(^\text{19}\) were discussed at the meeting. Unfortunately, the abstention from matters of State was not enough to keep the College in the good graces of the monarch and in the end, King James forbade their meetings the same year they began\(^\text{20}\). This royal setback did not kill the discipline of antiquarianism but it did end the ability for its scholars to meet in a public place and discuss the topics they traditionally explored. Spelman ended his short history with the sentiment, “But mine lying by me, and having been often desir’d of me by some of my Friends, I thought good upon a review and augmentation to let it creep abroad in the form you see it, wishing it might be recity’d by some better judgement”\(^\text{21}\).

Spelman’s hope that the idea would be reconstructed abroad betrayed the College’s

\(^{18}\) Ibid, 69.
\(^{19}\) Ibid, 70.
\(^{20}\) Ibid, 70.
\(^{21}\) Ibid, 70.
connections as well as predicted the resurrection of the College in a slightly different form, which became the Society of Antiquaries of London.

While King James’s proclamation ended the official meetings of the College, it did not deter the publishing of writings by the antiquarians who had initially started these discussions. However, before digging into the writings of the most prominent of the early antiquarians, it is necessary to explore how an antiquarian functioned. Unfortunately, there is no succinct definition of an antiquarian, even the Society of Antiquaries avoided any kind of limiting definition within their official charter, but there were tendencies derived from a survey of the most prominent scholars.

First is the overwhelming focus on British geography, legal, and religious history. Many of the pieces written by early antiquarians at least hinted at one of these topics when discussing England. For example, in Thomas Hearne’s A Collection of Curious Discourses, written by eminent antiquaries upon several heads in our English antiquities, of the 58 included essays, thirteen discussed the breakdown of land holdings in England, including “Of what Antiquity Shires were in England” by Mr. Arthur Agard (1540-1615), and “Of the time when England was first divided into Shires” by Mr. James Ley (1552-1629). Seventeen essays dealt with various aspects of the law in Britain, for example, “Of the Antiquity of Terms for the administration of justice in England” by Joseph

---
22 Hearne, Thomas, and Thomas Evans. A collection of curious discourses written by eminent antiquaries upon several heads in our English antiquities.: Together with Mr. Thomas Hearne's preface and appendix to the former edition. To which are added a great number of antiquary discourses written by the same authors. Most of them now first published from the original manuscripts. With an account of the lives and writings of the original Society of antiquarians. In two volumes (London: Printed for T. Evans, No 50, in the Strand, near York Buildings, 1773), VI; Both of these authors would also hold status as an influential authority according to the Society of Antiquaries official roster. A list which also included Archbishop Parker, James Lee, Lancelot Andrews, and Robert Beale, interestingly John Leland, William Camden, and John Milton, two of which who were founding members of the College at Bear’s Tavern do not make the official roster published in 1798; A list of the members of the Society of Antiquaries of London, from their revival in 1717, to June 19, 1796. Arranged in chronological and alphabetical order (London: Printed by and for John Nichols, 1798), 1.
Holland (d. 1605), and “Of the Antiquity of the Houses of Law” by Mr. Thynne. And while Hearne’s collection does not boast any directly titled essays on religious houses or law, there are other examples of this focus, including John Leland’s Itinerary in which he spent a significant amount of this six-hundred odd page itinerary detailing religious houses, churches, and castles across England. This included his meticulous descriptions of burials in specific priories or churches, building materials, landscape of the castle, and, importantly, who owned it. This type of chronicling was common among antiquarians requiring an extant source and accurate written records.

The second tendency was the paradoxical preference to travel to the location of English research but not utilize the physical reality. This is an odd propensity to describe but Morysen Fynes illustrated it best when he not only referenced Camden but encouraged the reader to, “…see the University of Cambridge, and view the most choice antiquities mentioned by Master Camden in Hartfordshire, Northhamptonshire…” According to his own travel journal, a four-hundred page behemoth, he traveled to these areas but never commented on them, instead referring the reader to earlier manuscripts, like Camden’s. However, he then went on to say, “Since the best and most generous wits most affect the seeing of forraigne Countries, and there can hardly be a man so blockish, so idle, or so malicious, as to discourage those that thirst after knowledge from so doing.”

There is an understood worth to observation outside England. In addition, while Fynes included England as one of his twelve domains, it was outside England he

---

23 Ibid, VIII
25 Fynes Moryson, An Itinerary written by Fynes Moryson, Gent.: First in the Latine Tongue, and then translated by him into English. (Containing his ten yeeres travell through the twelve dominions of Germany, Bohmerland, Sweitzerland, Netherland, Denmarke, Poland, Italy, Turky, France, England, Scotland, and Ireland) (London: J. Beale, 1617), 272.
26 Ibid, 313.
detailed significantly. For example, Ireland alone garnered about one hundred pages. Therefore, Fynes emphasized the idea of traveling within England to demonstrate his ability but he never took into account the utility of the location and instead referred the reader back to an older work. Traveling England legitimized the journey but was not a main focus of academic exploration and chronology. But herein lies the paradox of travelling in England first, because ignorance of the physical location allowed for significant missed opportunities and discoveries. Two of the most prevalent itineraries for the beginning of the antiquarians were Camden’s *Britannia*, the first chronicle of Britain, and John Leland’s *Itinerary*, written by the first self-styled antiquarian. The manuscripts were broken down based on the shire the author traveled to regardless of the context of the research but ultimately the site was not the primary focus of the trip, the textual evidence that could be collected there was.

This was why, for instance, when John Leland traveled through Wiltshire, home of Stonehenge, he did not mention the massive structure but he did mention the history of multiple nunneries and the fact that “John Scotte…translated Dionysius out of Greke into Latine”[27]. This oversight of necessary, contextual evidence was not acknowledged by Leland and while the author did not offer a reason for that, a bias of Camden’s might explain why. As Camden stated in his groundbreaking *Britannia*, textual evidence is the only way to truly know what happened[28]. Stonehenge did not have the textual evidence Leland’s nunneries did, leaving it without easily read history and depriving it of context. For as studious and academic as many of these men were, they tended to overlook important components of the antiquarian narrative. Camden fell into the same trap,

---

barely mentioning the sites of Stonehenge and Avebury but commenting on the ruins of Hadrian’s Wall. The main difference in these sites: there was recorded commentary on Hadrian’s Wall from multiple Roman, Saxon, and Danish sources while the same sources were mostly quiet on the other two sites. The lack of interest in physical sites led directly into the third tendency.

Arguably, the most important trait of an antiquarian was his unshakeable reliance on written records. While the more influential of the antiquarians traveled, the majority relied on written sources, which meant reliance on Roman or post-Roman records and the Bible, in lieu of older text. This led antiquarians to focus on textually corroborated sites and topics, many of them on the continent or more modern in terms of English history. Curran characterized it thusly, “Caesar and Gildas legitimized the urge to concentrate on the available records – the histories in the Roman authors – and to ignore the history which was not there.” This tendency went hand in hand with the rise of humanism; for example Camden published Britannia in 1586, and explicitly laid out the importance of the reliance on original sources. Unfortunately, for English antiquities, the early Britons did not leave written works; they left architectural evidence of their existence but were unfortunately illiterate. This left a noticeable gap in British antiquity, and forced those looking into the Island’s origins to start with the written sources. This is why Camden started his famous history with the Romans, why Leland failed to mention Stonehenge, why Robert Cotton collected Roman coins and books, and why when Inigo Jones ultimately argued, with the help of his son-in-law John Webb, that Stonehenge was created by the Romans it was not challenged for fifty years. The focus on textual

29 Camden, viii.
evidence left most of English’s early antiquities shrouded in shadow and ignored by those who were writing the origin stories of the country, leaving the early Britons as a cruel people who needed to be conquered to allow culture to permeate their barbarism. For as useful as textual evidence was for setting the stage and corroborating evidence, it did have weaknesses. These weaknesses would come to the fore as the question of nationalism developed because the only origins the English could point to were Roman, Danish, or Saxon, but none were native Britons.

How were the early Antiquarians different from early modern Historians?

While the English antiquarians wrote on the antiquities of the island, they were mired in the classical world and traditionally ignored the prehistoric, read pre-Roman, Britons. This could have opened up a space for the distinct discipline of historians to fill, unfortunately, this was not the case. As this suggests, antiquarians were not historians by early modern standards. These two disciplines operated in similar realms but did not address the same issues. As D.R. Woolf wrote in The Idea of History in Early Stuart England, “Late Elizabethan and early Stuart historical writers recognized in theory, even if they did not always observe in practice, a fundamental distinction between history proper and the newer antiquarian and philological explorations which became increasingly attractive toward the end of the sixteenth century”\(^{31}\). Woolf went on to break down the differences between the antiquarian and historical disciplines while demonstrating where the similarities, that never quite reconciled the two disparate masteries, lay. Where the antiquarians focused on geography, common law, and religion, historians, influenced by humanist rhetoric focused on political narratives of the modern

or medieval periods, emulating and commenting on the ancient masters but not copying them. This lead to the continuing reprinting of those ancient historians alongside the production of imitated versions of the ancient histories for more modern times. The separation of these two disciplines would prove as detrimental to the English origins as the ignorance of Stonehenge.

The early modern historian focused not on advancing historical accuracy and knowledge, but on reinterpreting historical or ancient events in the modern context. In devaluing the correction of historical inaccuracies, historians who did challenge understood and accepted histories were often seen as wrong by the numerous defenders of the original writings. Woolf mentioned the printed attack on Polydore Vergil by English and Welsh writers when Vergil debunked the myths of Brutus the Trojan and King Arthur of Monmouth, these attacks simply laid out the debunking as wrong without the consideration considered vital in today’s historiography. This led to the stagnation of the English foundation stories, marring the history of England and forcing the only true civilized nature to be born out of the Roman occupation. It was this uncertainty that lead John Speed, an early modern historian and a man claimed by the later Society of Antiquaries, to state, “In Britain the Druids, who had ruled Britain before the Romans, were ‘merely barbarous, [and] never troubled themselves with care to transmit their originals to posteritie’.

---

32 Ibid, 14.
33 Ibid, 30-31.
34 Ibid, 33.
35 Thomas Bensley, *A copy of the royal charter and statutes of the Society of Antiquaries of London: and of orders and regulations established by the Council of the Society* (London: Printed by T. Bensley, Bolt Court, Fleet Street, 1815), 2.
36 Woolf, 67.
have a written culture either, their ownership of one by the time they conquered England, made them a superior culture. And because the tendency among early modern historians was to “sketch the verifiable [from written, extant sources], the manners and customs of a people as a whole, and draw moral lessons from its rise and fall,” the ancient Britons left no history to utilize. This left the Roman history to stand on its own, making it the default and further driving home the position of Britain as a culturally devoid island until it was conquered.

During the Elizabethan period, it became common to distinguish between true history, a factual account of real events, and poetry or fable, the account of the fabulous, which called into question the earliest accounts of English history as the fantastic stories they were. It would be this question that would bring Camden, and others, to question Geoffrey of Monmouth’s story of Brutus, a story that will be looked at later in this thesis. The problem for the historian would be his inability to provide any evidence to truly correct these stories in conjunction with the trend throughout the discipline to remain from even attempting. The juxtaposition of the fantastic story of Brutus and the evidence backed Roman sources left early English history in a conundrum. It could not be explained without sources and it was not truly the realm of the historian. The inability of the antiquarians to explain pre-Roman history and the unwillingness of historians to explain it left English history in the Livy-esque realm of fantasy and myth, driving English intellectuals farther from a unique English heritage.

While the antiquarians and early modern historians orbited around the same problems, and today, what they were doing could be conceived as history, the two

37 Ibid, 67.
38 Ibid, 17.
disciplines did not adequately meld in the early modern period. Woolf contended that William Camden was the first scholar to come close to marrying antiquarianism and history without actually proposing his work, *The Remaines of a Greater Worke, concerning Britaine, the Inhabitants Thereof, Their Languages, Names, Surnames, Empreses, Wise Speeches, Poesies, and Epitaphs*, was a history. It would be the model used by Camden that started the process toward the unification of the two disciplines. John Selden continued and expanded upon the process using his incredible knowledge to expand the study of history. It would be the style of Selden that helped shift the historical conversation toward the exploration of “traditionally extrahistorical subjects.” This then spurred the disciplines to closer contact until in the 1630s when Woolf contended the words ‘antiquary’ and ‘historian’ were used synonymously and by the 1700s, it was possible to offer a defense for ‘historical antiquities’. However, Woolf argued that the two fields were never completely combined although they did overlap in ways they had not before and so there was still a distinction between the ideas of history and antiquarianism, allowing for the growth of both disciplines. To take a modern day comparison, antiquarianism and history are more similar to the disciplines of archaeology and history today. Historians of the ancient world utilize the work of archaeologists to reinforce literarily corroborated research while archaeologists utilize the work of historians to explain archaeological finds. While it is not possible to directly compare these two disciplines to the disciplines that existed in the early 1700s, the continuation of

---

39 Ibid, 201.
40 Ibid, 239-240.
41 Ibid, 241.
the antiquarian and historical disciplines as separate institutions demonstrates that the academic understanding of the two was not the same as the public understanding of them.

Ultimately, historians and antiquarians approached English history from different perspectives but both perspectives were blinded by the overwhelming power of the Roman Empire. Where antiquarians studied the classics as well as medieval and modern England and the historians emulated the classical authors and utilized their information for modern purposes, none would push beyond the Roman invasion in any serious way. That left a shocking hole in English history and made it difficult to create a coherent and factual history of the creation of England. This hole made the rise of nationalism in England more difficult because England was based on a conqueror while the other countries of Europe were able to claim a direct tie to their culture and land.

While early modern history and antiquarianism shared similar topics, their approach to the subject varied and because of that, the approach the antiquarians of the 1700s took would have a profound impact on the narrative of English nationalism. Since the historians were not able to provide the evidence necessary to disprove the fantastic stories of the foundation of the island, it fell to the work of antiquarians, and one antiquarian in particular, to provide evidence to fill that void. However, before exploring this shift, it is necessary to take a detailed look at two of the most important antiquarian, and one historian’s, explanations of English history: John Leland’s *Itinerary*, William Camden’s *Britannia*, and John Milton’s *History of Britain*. While these are not the only pieces written on British history, these works are some of the earliest authors given the title of antiquarian and some of the first British histories or travel journals written in the early modern period. In addition, these sources maintained their influence, if not
authority, throughout the modern period as well as earning reference from later antiquarians, including William Stukeley.

**John Leland**

While William Camden was one of the best-known writers to emerge as a product of the Renaissance in England, John Leland was possibly more important for the story of the antiquarians because of his tendency to distinguish nearly every published work as “antiquario autore”\(^{44}\). Leland took this title seriously, dedicating his academic life to fulfilling his commission to find, “England’s antiquities, and peruse the libraries of all cathedrals, abbies, priories, colleges, &c. as also all places wherein records, writings, and secrets of Antiquity were reposited”\(^{45}\). This was what ultimately led Leland to spend the preceding six years zigzagging across the countryside cataloguing the antiquities found in England because he was convinced “…it would conduce much to the honor of the nation, and the benefit of learning…”\(^{46}\). Leland succeeded in this goal, producing the first detailed travel account of England, a task he was specifically suited to because of his training and experience.

Leland’s early life was a bit of a mystery, there was no record of his birth year but he was born on 13 September the early sixteenth century in London\(^{47}\). When he was young, both his parents passed away and Thomas Myles, a close relative or family friend,

\(^{44}\) Looking over multiple writings by John Leland, the constant is that title and it is not seen with any of the other early antiquarians including William Camden, Thomas Hearne, or Sir Henry Spelman, who used the moniker “knight” following his name.

\(^{45}\) William Huddesford et al., *The lives of those eminent antiquaries John Leland, Thomas Hearne, and Anthony à Wood; with an authentick account of their respective writings and publications, from original papers* (Oxford: Printed at the Clarendon Press, for J. and J. Fletcher, in the Turl, and Joseph Pote, at Eton College, 1772), 9-10.

\(^{46}\) Ibid, 11.

took him into his care. After Myles took in Leland, he enrolled his charge under the tutelage of William Lillye, a grammarian and master of St. Paul’s School\textsuperscript{48}. Following his training with Lillye, Leland studied at Christ’s College in Cambridge before he finished his education at All Souls, Oxford where he learned Greek, Latin, Saxon, and Welsh. The last two languages considered by John Bale, a close friend and author of the book about Leland’s life, the “ancient languages of his country”\textsuperscript{49}. When Leland finished his training at Oxford, Myles sent him to study in Paris under Francis Sylvius where he profited from the expansion of the revival of Greek in Italy, France, and some parts of Germany. While Bale does not label it as such, the description of Leland’s trip was reminiscent of the Grand Tour that would begin in earnest in the next century\textsuperscript{50}. For Leland, it solidified the course his academic career would take as, “…he not only perfected his former studies in the Greek, and Latin Tongues, but also acquired great knowledge in the French, Italian, and Spanish Languages…”\textsuperscript{51}. With this knowledge under his belt, Leland travelled back to England where he entered Holy Orders, became the chaplain to Henry VIII and created a connection that allowed him to expand his reach and knowledge into the antiquarian discipline.

From 1533-1539 Leland, travelled England and recorded everything he deemed relevant. This resulted in a large collection of travel notes and their importance was not lost on his contemporaries. Unfortunately, Leland died before he was able to organize the notes in a proper itinerary and the massive number of notes Leland collected was,

\textsuperscript{48} Ibid, 3.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid, 4.
\textsuperscript{50} Bale makes the point, “Italy and France, were now the seat of Greek learning; and Foreigners, from all parts, resorted to those Countries in pursuit of their Studies. Thus we read, that not only our Countrymen, but many learned men also of the age, from Germany and Holland, left their native homes in search of this new knowledge…” Ibid, 7.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid, 8.
“sought after by persons of the first rank and learning in the kingdom, as the greatest
treasurer, K. Edward expressed great concern for his loss; and in order to preserve his
valuable collection, ordered in Council, that all due care should be taken to preserve them
from loss, and falling into the improper hands…”52. From here, the notes were dispersed
throughout the intellectual community, a large portion of the Itinerary papers were
purchased by William Burton, an antiquarian in his own right, who in 1632 deposited the
records in the Bodleian Library. Other well-known antiquarians in the early seventeenth
century divvied up the remaining notes; Sir Robert Cotton was one of the most significant
collectors53. Leland’s notes became vitally important to the development of
antiquarianism, setting trends that endured after his death.

Thomas Hearne’s John Leland’s Itinerary of England and Ireland eventually
published Leland’s notes in a coherent manuscript. It was a comprehensive look at the
major cities, towns, and shires of the British Isles accumulated from his studious,
sometimes tedious notes. It is important reiterate that John Leland did not compile this
Itinerary; the notes are his but he passed away before they could be published, so this
collection of papers was put together by another antiquarian. However, that did not offset
much of the tedium and Hearne did not seem to write more than the forward. The
itinerary has a predictable pattern. Leland recorded short entries for each of the places he
visited. For Bedfordshire, the first area surveyed, the initial entry was a list of the market
towns within the region followed by the castles and the names of the owners, a basic
entry read thusly, “The Castel of Bedford hard by the Towne, now clene down. There is
a Place caullid Falxherbar agayn the Castel. The Castle of Hamtel. The Lorde Fanepe, a

52 Ibid, 26-27.
man of greate fame in owteward Warres, and very riche, builded this House”[^54]. From here, Leland added incredibly minute detail. Bale eloquently summarized Leland’s detail when he wrote; “he inspected the libraries, the windows, and other monuments of Antiquity, belonging to the several cathedrals, monasteries, convents, &c., therein. And whenever he heard there were footsteps of any Roman, Saxon, or Danish buildings, he went in search of them, and took particular notice of the Tumuli, Coins, and Inscriptions…”[^55] However, it was Leland’s perceptive notations of almost every facet of the shires that emphasized his lack of interest in any historical, non-literary, elements pointedly anything before the Roman conquest. Leland was the first to claim the title of antiquarian and spark interest in England but he also enshrined some of the antiquarian tendencies that plagued the advancement of the understanding of English antiquity. When looked at critically with a focus on later works, Leland’s *Itinerary* had inaccurate, confused vocabulary, a reliance on written sources, and ignorance of pre-Roman history. However, the book was a double-edged sword because it was a highly influential book that was widely available, extending interest in antiquarianism but also perpetuating the misconceptions.

Inaccurate vocabulary posed an issue because of the uncertain timeline it created, a problem for both historians and antiquarians. Leland used the terms ‘antiquity’ and ‘ancient’, as synonyms for ‘old’, in connection with monuments and structures as well as when referring to the cathedrals, monasteries, and convents. This propagated the assumption that the latter buildings were closer in age to the monuments that actually predated them by more than eight hundred years. For example, the oldest church in

[^55]: Huddesford, 11.
England is St. Martin’s in Canterbury built in 597 CE\textsuperscript{56} for Queen Bertha of Kent before Augustine arrived in England from Rome and Leland referred to it as ‘ancient’, while the Romans, whose constructions were ancient, showed up on the shores of Britain nearly 500 years earlier in 55 BCE\textsuperscript{57}. Referring to both periods as ancient reinforced a mythical understanding of English antiquity by fusing disparate parts and understating the chronological distances between significant constructions. To address any concerns of anachronistic thinking, the writers in Leland’s period understood the fall of Rome and the Renaissance as two distinct eras so it would make sense they recognized the significance of the passage of time. So when Leland wrote about the Church of St. Mary’s in Wiltshire, he mentioned, “There be auncient tumbes on the south side, wherof one hath a image of marble of a man or warre”\textsuperscript{58}. It was possible for him to distinguish between Roman and post-Roman times for ancient, instead the ancient aqueducts shared an expanse of time with St. Mary’s Church. This church could not be ancient in the same way the Romans and the prehistoric Britons were but with the interchangeable language, chronological distinctions become difficult. Moreover, while the majority of the educated individuals at the time knew that the Romans occupied the island before these religious institutions, it compressed the timeline of the island to equate these terms.

While that compression was not as significant for sources with textual evidence because many provided reconcilable dates, it had major implications for pre-Roman chronology because, when combined with the dominant theory that the world was only 6,000 years from the Creation, there was little space for those who predated the Romans. And since


\textsuperscript{58} John Leland and Lucy Toulmin Smith, 265.
the Britons maintained a culture dependent on the spoken word there was no historicity to their culture, which perpetuated the mystery and fiction of the early British, leaving the Roman, Saxon, and Danish conquerors as British ancestors.

It was not simply the vocabulary that reinforced this compacted timeline. Leland’s reliance on the Roman evidence as the oldest, and most significant source, propagated it and emphasized the inability of English ancestors. Romans liked to write, especially about conquests, and Britain was one of these conquests so naturally the Romans took a greater role in Leland’s Itinerary. For instance, the basis of his journeys was what Leland called the “Four Great Roman Ways”; the major roadways the Romans supposedly constructed throughout Britain. There were multiple stories throughout his itinerary about farmers ploughing up Roman coins in their fields or the existence of Latin inscriptions older than the Medieval Latin of the church. In Sinodune, he mentioned, “At this tymte it berith very plentifullye booth barley and whete, and numismata Romanorum be ther found yn ploughying”

Roman coins were bountiful in England and many antiquarians, Leland included, took that as a sign of the accuracy of Roman accounts.

Similarly, the Saxons and Danes featured throughout the itinerary. The Danes were destructive, credited with destroying a monestary at Wedon, a tower in Old Lincoln, and defacing the town of Dorchester, while the Saxons provided an era of restoration before the Normans, attributed with rebuilding new Lincoln on the destruction of old Lincoln as well as constructing multiple castles and fortresses. In an essay Leland
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59 Huddesford, 91.
60 John Leland and Lucy Toulmin Smith, 120.
61 Ibid, 10; 31; 117
62 Ibid, 31; 109; 131
wrote as a New Years Gift to Henry VIII, he proposed a book entitled *De Nobilitate Britannica* that reinforced this historical legacy,

The first shaul declare the names of kings, quenes, with theyr childerne, dukes, erles, lords, capitaines, and rulers un this reaulme to the coming of the Saxons and their conqueste. The secunde shaul be of the Saxons and the Danes to the victorie of King William the Greate. The thirde from the Normans to the reigne of yowr moste noble grace, descendinge lineally of the Britanne, Saxon and Norman kings.

This essay in combination with the research included in the multiple versions of the *Itinerary* left little space for an English origin beyond her conquerors. Britons do not feature in the lineage of Leland’s patron, which further aligned the origins of English civilization with her conquerors as opposed to her ancestors.

The most glaring oversight in *Itinerary* was the absence of any of the prehistoric sites that demonstrated a culture older than the literary evidence. Neither Stonehenge nor Avebury, both prehistoric sites in Wiltshire, were not mentioned and given the detail in Leland’s notes and as much time as he seemed to have spent in Wiltshire, there should have been some mention of these two highly visible sites either by name or by description. The lack of inclusion of structures as large and landscape dominating as these is difficult to justify for an author who took such detailed notes on England and Ireland. Similarly to Stonehenge and Avebury, the White Horse at Uffington did not make an appearance although the mentioned the location when he wrote, “Hic Thomas obit apud Uffintonn & sepultus est Rievalli” but that is the only mention. While it is possible to make the argument that Hearne left out these pieces for the itinerary, the later
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63 Ibid, xlii.
64 The shire takes up sixteen pages in the itinerary but there is no mention of Stonehenge or Avebury, either by name of description. Ibid, 127, 130-135, 136, 258-269.
65 Ibid, 92.
scholar mentioned he remained as faithful as possible to the notes\textsuperscript{66}, which ultimately left these overlooked sites as missing. While it was the prerogative of the author to choose what to include, the claim to collect a country’s antiquity without mention of pre-historic sites created a bias against these sites by later scholars and antiquaries.

Leland’s \textit{Itinerary} and his other essays were significant and necessary for the creation of the antiquarian discipline. Leland’s writings inspired later antiquarians, as Thomas Huddesford pointed out,

> Besides the singular use made of Leland’s papers by Mr. Burton, abovementioned, in his history of Leicestershire, it is notes by Mr. Wood, and Mr. Hearne, in their respective accounts of our Author, before referred to, that Camden in his Britannia, and Sr. William Dugdale, in his history of Warwickshire, as also in his Baronnage of England, made use of Leland’s collections, in their respective noble works…\textsuperscript{67}

These accolades continued for the next five pages and mentioned names of scholars counted among the earliest members of the Society of Antiquaries, demonstrating the importance of the “first antiquarian” to the continuation of the discipline’s study. Leland was a force for the growth of antiquarianism and those that followed built on his efforts. However, at the same time, they perpetuated his misconceptions. These errors created an understanding of English origins wholly dominated by conquerors and reinforcing the cosmopolitanism of early antiquarianism. However, Leland was the beginning and Camden would go a step beyond by solidifying Leland’s historical illusions in the guise of scientific discovery.

\textit{William Camden}

William Camden was probably the most famous of Leland’s admirers. He was never offered the title of antiquarian but he did further the discipline significantly, albeit

\textsuperscript{66} Hearne, ii.
\textsuperscript{67} Huddesford, 28-33.
inadvertently. Like Leland, he was educated at Oxford, where he studied the Classics. For the rest of his life, Camden lived and worked in London, including teaching at the Westminster school and serving as the Librarian of Westminster Abbey. Nevertheless, Camden’s significance to antiquarianism and this story came while he was teaching. In 1585, he joined the fledgling College of Antiquaries and published Britannia, the first modern comprehensive study of the history of the British Isles and Ireland, in the following year. He remained an active member of the College for its duration, while moving up within the political realm. He took a key position in the College of Heralds and remained on good terms with Queen Elizabeth for the entirety of her reign allowing him to continue his study of English antiquities. Throughout his long career, Camden trained many of the standouts of the next antiquarianism generation, one of the most influential, Sir Robert Cotton, became a well-known scholar and collector in his own right. Although Camden was never ostentatiously wealthy, he did have enough money to travel around Britain multiple times, creating the basis for Britannia. However, unlike many of the later antiquarians, Camden never travelled overseas and continually worked in a professional capacity while writing. Ultimately though, Camden was a product of his time and the Classical training he received from Greek and Roman historians shaped his career and his most famous book.

Camden’s first goal in Britannia was to answer a call from other scholars of Europe specifically Abraham Ortelius, mentioned earlier. But outside of the cosmopolitan reason, there seemed to be a genuine effort to restore some dignity to British scholarship and some factual history to the country as Camden tried.

---

…to renew what was old, illustrate what was obscure, and settle what was
doubtful; and upon the whole, to recover (as much as possible) a Certainty in our
Affairs, which either the carelessness of Writers, or credulity of Readers, had
bereft us of. A great attempt, not to say impossible! to which undertaking, as none
know the Pains that is requisite, so none believe it, but they who have made the
Experiment 70.

The volume was meant to be a factual exploration of the history other English
intellectuals had failed to complete, a reality which left Britain at a distinct disadvantage
when compared to other European powers who had written that origin. This deficiency
placed the country behind the cosmopolitan, intellectual curve of the rest of Europe. So
in a patriotic effort to repair this historical deficiency, Camden looked to explain the
misconceptions and falsehoods circulating about Britain.

Camden began by addressing the origins of the British nation, he directly
commented on the most prominent and in-depth explanation available by Geoffrey of
Monmouth written in the twelfth century tome, *History of the Kings of Britain* 71. Until
Camden’s history, Monmouth’s work served as the only credible source on the British
origins but it was full of fantastic stories. One of the worst offenders was the Brutus
foundation story that tied the Britons to the infamously doomed city of Troy and
consequently to the establishment of Rome, to which Camden commented he,
“…strained [his] Invention to the utmost to support it” 72. Unfortunately, for the evidence
driven Camden and luckily for the Brutus myth, there was only enough substantiation
within the established British historiography to explain away falsehoods, not identify a

70 William Camden, *Britannia or a chorographical description of Great Britain and Ireland ... translated into english with additions and improvements: 2d ed. revised ... by Edmund Gibson*, Edited by Edmund Gibson, (London: Mary Mattheus, 1722), 91.
71 There was another authority on early English history as well, Bede, William of Malmsbury, wrote the *Ecclesiastical History of England* but his discussion on the earliest inhabitants of the island were not as in depth as that written by Monmouth so Camden focused on the work by Monmouth with a few asides to Bede, Camden, ix.
truth. And so, for as much time as he spent on British origins, Camden was unwilling to verify any one story, instead laying out all of them to give the reader a chance to decide and paradoxically, not providing any story with any measure of falsehood. To return to Brutus, Camden explained why others took issue with the story, he explained that many called it false, but Camden backed off before he agreed with any of this analysis. He stated, “For my part it shall never trouble me, if Brutus pass current for the father and founder of the British Nation. Let the Britains descent stand good, as they deduce it from the Trojans.” Camden in not so many words supported the Brutus story by citing the lack of evidence for any other explanation. This left British origins in the fantastical realm until written documents pulled it into the light.

However, Camden’s unwillingness to take a stance on the origins of the British nation created a sharp distinction between verifiable history and fanciful stories. Unfortunately, this placed British origins in the realm of the unknowable and ridiculous. The Brutus story Camden refused to support or deny claimed Britain had been an island of giants before Brutus, scholars recognized the fantasy in this but Camden’s reluctance to unequivocally point to the story as mythical drew a sharper line between pre-Roman Britain and the Britain of the Romans. In the first section, Camden compared the mythological history of early Britain to the evidenced Roman conquest, which drove the actual British ancestors farther into the mists of fantasy and pulled the Romans and later consequences into the light of evidence-based history. This gave Britain a definitive history of conquest, strange for a country asserting its dominance on a world stage. The
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74 Ibid, xi.
kings of the post-Roman work were not English but Norman, Saxon, and Danish, and the heroes Camden emphasized were not English but conquerors who would shape Britain.

That being said, Camden’s *Britannia* was a groundbreaking piece of historical and antiquarian literature; he “made pioneering use of coinage and inscriptions to explore political, economic, and social dimensions of the early history of England and Wales…[as well as] a pioneer in his investigation of the etymology of place-names and surnames…”75. These were significant advances from Leland’s *Itinerary* because Camden attempted to pull British history into the factual realm. His focus gave Britain at least a partial history that could be researched and proven, a history that could be looked at by scholars of France and Germany and demonstrated Britain was a modern country. Unfortunately, his history was not free of misconceptions and overlooked significant evidence.

Camden made major advancements in the study of numismatics and etymology, but there were some significant deficiencies in his writing as well. Camden ultimately began his history with the Romans, because although he spent a short couple of chapters on those ancient Britons who inhabited England and Wales before the invasion, the bulk of the information was from Julius Caesar, Tacitus, and Agricola, among other well-known Roman and Greek writers with corroboration evidence from Monmouth and the Bible. The Romans were not overly kind to their subjects, and painted them as uncivilized masses that were closest in manner and stature to the Gauls76. There were variations but the Romans were consistent enough to allow for a compilation of British
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75 Richardson, 117.
76 Camden, Vol 1, xli-xlii.
characteristics. The most common trait was their warlike prowess\textsuperscript{77}. They were skilled in the use of chariots, which allowed them to answer any martial challenge with “the speed of the Horse, and the steadiness of the Foot, and by daily use and practice are so expert in it, that upon the side of a steep hill, they can stop and check their horses at full speed…”\textsuperscript{78}. Caesar wrote this in his trademark style, characterizing the Britons as noble savages, which was useful to emphasize his own martial expertise because he ultimately did defeat them. However, this martial prowess was not quite as admired in the early age of antiquarianism especially given the overriding influence of cosmopolitanism and the value of intellect so when the British martial skills paired with their apparent lack of culture, the grudging respect shown by Caesar meant little to early modern antiquarians.

Camden emphasized this embarrassing focus when he claimed the early Britons were too busy fighting each other to develop high culture\textsuperscript{79}. This primitiveness was the antithesis of sixteenth and seventeenth century intellectual values. However, the Britons’ warlike ways were not their only handicap. According to Caesar, the Britons lived in wooden or reed huts and shared all their wives, with any children cared for by the first husband\textsuperscript{80}. The question of private property was apparently unknown to them; a concept foreign in a world of collectors and economic study, which pushed the Britons further from the ancestors researching them. But the biggest difference was the obvious dichotomy between the spoken, crude culture of early Britons and the revered classical culture of the Romans, which valued writing, learning, and individual glory. Camden’s

\textsuperscript{77} The entire reason Caesar even goes over to England in the first place was because the Britons were helping the Gauls and he was having issues maintaining order in his providence of Gallica. Edwards, book v, 249.
\textsuperscript{78} Camden, Vol 1, xli.
\textsuperscript{79} Ibid, vol I, xli.
\textsuperscript{80} Ibid, vol 1, xli, xlii.
bias emphasized the role of the Renaissance in scholarship, as he preferred the cultured conquerors to the primitive savages who painted their bodies with woad to appear more violent and terrifying\textsuperscript{81}. It was unsurprising that given these characteristics and the lack of evidence from pre-Roman Britain that Camden chose to start his work with the Romans as the first real culture in Britain.

This lack of culture was only one of Camden’s hesitations to beginning with early British history because while the Romans had their own fantastic foundation stories, they wrote them down, necessary for understanding factual history. The grating and unhistorical nature of oral tradition was one Camden commented on, which further emphasized the barbarity of the Britons, “…even among the Greek and Roman authors, who were the learned part of the world; much more, among barbarous and unlearned people, such as were, at that time, all the inhabitants of these Northern Parts”\textsuperscript{82}. This narrative of uncultured people was compounded by the knowledge that the learned Druidic and bardic practices relied on the spoken word\textsuperscript{83}. All this completed the picture of a people who, while skilled and brave fighters, lacked any cultural accomplishments, leaving those who wanted to understand British origins to look past these pitiful ancestors and focus on those who brought the island out of the swirling mists of mythology and fiction.

Camden’s dismissive nature of the early Britons had significant consequences for antiquarian understanding and the interpretation of some of England’s most famous

\textsuperscript{81} Ibid, vol 1, xli.
\textsuperscript{82} Ibid, 204.
\textsuperscript{83} Camden made the point to state “Moreover the Druids, who were the Priests among the Britains and Gauls and to whose care was committed the preservation of the ancient Traditions; and likewise the Bards, who made it their business to celebrate all gallant and remarkable adventures; both the one and the other thought it unlawful to commit any thing to books or writing”. Ibid, 199.
monuments, specifically Stonehenge. The historian’s handling of Stonehenge offered a poignant illustration of the effect of this perpetuated characterization of the early Britons,

One great argument by which Mr. Jones establishes his own opinion, is, that it is a thing altogether improbable, that the Britains could build such a Monument. But the contrary is evident...from the vast stones mention’d by Dr. Platt to be in or near the British city or fortification hard by Wrotteslet in Staffordshire; and from the parcels of stones (not unlike Stonehenge) that are in some parts of Scotland and Wales, whither the Romans and Danes never came. It is true, those monuments have not their Architraves (which Stonehenge has...;) and this makes it probably, that Stonehenge was built after the Romans came in, and in imitation of some of their structures; tho’, as to the general part of the work, it appears to have been unartificial and favours of their primitive rudeness. For that the Britains, among other parts of Humanity and Elegance, learn’d something of Architecture from the Romans, is plain from the life of Agricola⁸⁴.

Camden was correct to point out Mr. Jones, who published a work attributing Stonehenge to the Romans, was wrong but his reasoning behind it betrayed his belief that the early Britons could not have produced a monument without Roman influence, driving home the primitiveness of the culture. Camden stressed that the British could have constructed the impressive site of Stonehenge but only as a rude imitation of Roman construction. Evidence that Stonehenge was constructed after the Romans relied on one particular assumption, that the British did not even construct homes of anything but reeds and wood so they could not have constructed a monument of stone without the influence of a more advanced power. Camden emphasized the British had constructed Stonehenge because there are similar monuments found in Scotland and Wales in places where the Romans never travelled, so it could not have been the Romans that constructed it. However, given his understanding of early British culture, he assumed that they knew nothing of architecture and therefore needed the influence of an advanced culture to construct even a rude copy. Camden’s Britons had inadvertently become a sponge, infinitely impressed by the Roman skill evidenced by their best attempt at imitation, which ultimately failed.

⁸⁴ Ibid, 124.
In addition to this inability to create a monument, the British only created it to mimic a Roman structure but they did so crudely given their primitive nature. So ultimately, the Romans civilized the British providing an origin, and teaching them to build large monuments, but not to the same level of precision and beauty as the Romans, leaving them as eternally inferior. These conclusions about Stonehenge also further confused the timeline of Britain by pushing Neolithic constructions into the post-Roman period and ensuring there was no perceived British impact before the Romans, allowing stories of giants and demi-gods to maintain the position in Britain’s origins. Camden’s goal was to clear the mists of history and provide an understanding of the formation of Britain but what he truly did was strengthen the distinction Leland had set up between the ancient Britons and their conquerors. In addition, because of the influence of Camden, this distinction existed for years after his death, as evidenced by the multiple publications of *Britannia*, including multiple translations from its original Latin.

William Camden was a prominent antiquarian, who utilized groundbreaking techniques like numismatics and etymology to further the study of antiquarism. When the Society of Antiquaries reformed in 1717, *Archaeologia*, the Society’s meeting publication emphasized and furthered Camden’s work on these two fledgling fields. But knowledge on the formation of Britain was handicapped by many of his conclusions, leaving antiquarians to give the Romans, and later cultures, unwarranted credit for the foundation of early Britain. Building on the work of Leland, Camden drove home the narrative that British culture started with the invasion and imitation of another, continental based, power. Camden demonstrated the deficiencies of early British culture that left it lagging behind what would become one of the classical cultures of the world, an embarrassing heritage for a modern country.
John Milton

John Milton wrote the last of the influential manuscripts, and the first of the true histories, to analyze for the baseline of how antiquarian understanding changed. While Milton was better known for his poetry, it was his prestige, which made his historical work a significant source for the study of British origins. Milton had a similar story to both Camden and Leland in terms of travel and education but with some notable exceptions. Milton was born in December 1608 in London to John and Sara Milton. John Milton, his father, was disowned for switching to Protestantism and became a scrivener to support his family. The younger Milton was meant to stand out from an early age, “My father destined me from a child to the pursuits of literature; and my appetite for knowledge was so voracious, that from twelve years of age, I hardly ever left my studies, or went to bed before midnight.” Milton’s father paid for private tutors and grammar school until the younger Milton was able to go to Cambridge where he received his Masters of Arts. From here, he took a five-year hiatus from academics until his mother passed away, which spurred Milton’s desire to travel Europe.

He spent more than a year on the continent, most of time in Rome taking, in the ancient ruins that littered the landscape. However, he also spent time at the French court where he met Hugo Grotius, the ambassador of Sweden, “and to whose house I was accompanied by some of his lordship’s friends.” The various homes and parties he visited throughout his time in Europe created the cosmopolitan connections Milton valued so highly later in his academic life. Milton impressed his European hosts and
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friends, earning a reputation for excellent company and educated discussions, building relationships that would last the course of his life. After spending some months in Italy, Milton planned to travel to Sicily and Greece when he was informed of the civil commotions in England and decided to return home, “I thought it base to be travelling for amusement abroad, while my fellow-citizens were fighting for liberty at home”89. There was a level of patriotism to his actions but he still decried leaving the world of culture to return to England so he solidified his connections to ensure his publications did not remain solely in Britain. Network and plan in place, Milton traveled home through Italy and France, where he began tutoring and, more importantly, writing.

While Milton had been writing throughout his travels, usually with a friend in mind90, it was when he returned to England that he refocused his talents, “…I perceived that if I ever wished to be of use, I ought at least not be wanting to my country…in a crisis of so much danger; I therefore determined to relinquish the other pursuits in which I was engaged, and to transfer the whole force of my talents and my industry to this one important object.”91. Writing about England became Milton’s purpose and after his return, he published his first book, Of Reformation in England, and the Causes that hitherto have hindered it, with the civil crisis in mind92. From here he continued on this path, explaining his cause as only a classically trained historian could, “Those Greeks and Romans, who are the objects of our admiration, employed hardly any other virtue in the extirpation of tyrants, than that love of liberty which made them prompt in seizing the
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sword, and gave them strength to use it”⁹³. Milton wrote to support his country and religion while fighting what he deemed tyranny, even defending Cromwell to an extent while writing *Paradise Lost*, arguably his most famous work. However, his support of English virtue took a more factual turn in *The History of Britain*. Published unfinished in 1670, Milton chronicled through the Norman Conquest in the six extant chapters. Milton died in November 1674, and one of his many chroniclers, Rufus Griswold, an American, remembered him thusly, “He was the greatest of all human beings: the noblest and the ennobler of mankind. He is steadily grown in the world’s reverence, and his fame will still increase with the lapse of ages”⁹⁴. This fame still holds today but Rufus’s characterization of his importance was not lost on his immediate successors, his history and his cosmopolitan connections were significant for his writing and his remembrance.

Going beyond even the other two authors, Milton displayed Newman’s cosmopolitanism in the clearest way. Where both Leland and Camden mentioned Europe as a reason for writing their histories, Milton defined the European audience as the primary focus throughout his career. For instance, when he defended himself against character disparaging charges made by a French scholar, Claude de Salmasius⁹⁵ during the Civil War, Milton stated,

> It has excited such general and such ardent expectation, that I imagine myself not in the forum or on the rostra, surrounded only by the people of Athens or of Rome; but about to address in this as I did in my former defence, the whole collective body of people, cities, states, and councils of the wise and eminent, through the wide expanse of anxious and listening Europe…Here I behold the stout and manly prowess of the Germans, disdaining servitude; there the generous and lively

---

⁹⁴ Ibid, vol I, x.
impetuosity of the French; on this side, the calm and stately valour of the Spaniard; on that, the composed and wary magnanimity of the Italian. Milton laid out his audience in this defense; his focus was overseas, on those influential individuals he met during his time in Europe. He was nearly as concerned about how he was perceived by the educated, European elite, as he was concerned about Britain’s reputation. He knew Europe watched and discussed the events in Britain and because he chose to return to Britain, the better his homeland looked, the better he looked. This would sound like nationalism if only the audience was shifted, if Europe was secondary or not mentioned, the importance of British opinion would be the primary motivation, but Milton’s focus on European interests and characteristics belied that claim.

Not only was this a cosmopolitan defense of Milton’s own reputation and England’s but it also underlined some international intrigue to which Milton had been privy. Milton specifically mentioned a villainous man named More, who was half French and half Scot so neither country would have to shoulder his treachery. More was accused of adultery with a maidservant in Geneva where he was studying Greek and, ultimately, “judged unworthy of the ecclesiastical function”, a charge which was recorded for posterity in the public library in Geneva. But Salmasius, a French religious official, still invited More to officiate the French church at Middleburgh in the Netherlands. There were some other instances of bribery and covert promises that ultimately painted both More and Salmasius in unflattering lights. But it was the Europeanness of this entire exchange that is of interest. More had Scottish and French heritage, the public decision of his ecclesiastical ineligibility was stored in the public

---
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library in Geneva, and Salmiasius, a French scholar who wrote a defense of Charles II, invited More to serve in a French church in the Netherlands. This intrigue spanned multiple countries making it impossible to argue against the interconnectedness of the upper European classes, a connection to which Milton was no exception. He seemed to have been distinctly aware and worried about these connections because the last reason he gave for writing the defense was, “Lastly, because in a matter of so much moment, and which excited such ardent expectations, I did not disappoint the hopes not the opinions of my fellow-citizens; while men of learning and eminence abroad honoured me with unmingled approbation…”99. Milton reinforced his European connections while also hoping he did not disappoint his countrymen, emphasizing his reputation in Europe and tying that back to his work in England. While he seemed to focus on Britain, he still included those European connections.

The cosmopolitan connections are necessary for the context in which Milton wrote The History of Britain. Milton was not considered an antiquarian nor was he a member of the College of Antiquaries but his History of Britain relied on many of the same themes and sources as Leland and Camden’s, as well as informing later research into the field even though Milton never finished his history100. That being said, there was much packed into the completed five and a half books. But while the information might imitate the earlier works, Milton’s style differed markedly from Leland and Camden’s. Where both the earlier authors focused on evidence, Milton’s read in the way a poet’s account should read, facts mixed with hyperbole and conjecture, with fantasy thrown in for good measure. Where Leland and Camden focused on the tangible and provable,

Milton’s would not have been out of place next to Livy’s, *The Early History of Rome* or Tacticus’s, *The Annals*. The story of Britain was of preeminent importance and that led to the significance of Milton’s work.

Milton’s work was fantastic in the way that ancient foundation stories were fantastic. He first laid out the origin stories of Britain before he explained the story he believed had the most authority, the foundation of Britain by Brutus as recorded by Geoffrey of Monmouth\(^1\). But before he began any stories he added a disclaimer, “What ever might be the reason, this we find, that of British Affairs, from the first peopling of the Iland to the coming of Julius Caesar, nothing certain, either by Tradition, History, or Ancient Fame hath hitherto bin left us. That which we have of oldest seeming, hath by the greater part of judicious Antiquaries bin long rejected for a modern Fable”\(^2\). It was similar to the way Camden addressed the story. Milton offered pieces of the story other academics had taken issue with before, relaying the story in full with no definitive argument by the author of what was correct. This makes sense given Woolf’s characterization of historians as unwilling to contradict those preceding sources given the lack of evidence to do so\(^3\). Regardless of his disclaimer, Milton relayed the twelfth century Odyssey-esque story originally written by Monmouth in a way that imitated Virgil’s story of Aeneas’s arrival in Italy. In Virgilian fashion, Milton’s Brutus was a son of Silvius, grandson of Ascanius, and great-grandson of Aeneas, tying the British founder to both Troy and Rome. The first book explained the grand claims of the origins of the Britons. The elements Milton included reinforced the conclusions on the early Britons.

---


\(^2\) Ibid, 1.

\(^3\) Woolf, 12.
reached by the earlier antiquarians, because of the utter lack of culture and incredibly warlike nature of the ancient Britons.

Milton’s use of etymology mimicked Camden’s. He took time to trace the name of the island through the most common origin stories before landing back on the story of Brutus, the only one with textual backing\textsuperscript{104}. Aided by the more believable nature of Brutus’s story he also recorded more unbelievable stories, including his attempted explanation for the name “Albion”, which is how the Romans and Greeks knew the island\textsuperscript{105}. But this is where the history blatantly became a work of fiction because Albion was supposedly derived from the giant Albion, a son of Neptune who inhabited the island of Britain after the flood and ruled it for forty-four years. While Milton deemed this explanation unlikely, the idea of giants in Britain did not fade. In fact, in the Brutus story, Albion shows up again. In order to provide a home for the displaced Trojans, Brutus made it to Albion but, “The Iland not yet Britain but Albion, was in a manner desert and inhospitable; kept only by a remnant of Giants; whose excessive Force and Tyrannie had consum’d the rest”\textsuperscript{106}. There were no humans on the British Isle, only giants who ruled through fear and force, which created a country to be colonized and offered culture by an invading force. It is difficult to miss the similarities of the cultureless giants to the depictions of the early Britons of Camden and Leland. The fantastic explanation in this story, especially following on the coattails of Camden who was methodical in his evidence, offered a reinforcement of the conclusions of Camden and Leland; that there were no people on the island before the remnants of Troy offered culture. It was after the victory of Brutus that Britain was named but, more importantly,

\textsuperscript{104} At least in terms of written histories, Milton cited Geoffrey of Monmouth for this section; Ibid, 4.
\textsuperscript{105} Ibid, 2.
\textsuperscript{106} Ibid, 7.
tamed, because as the giants were destroyed and the island returned to the realm of civilization. At least as long as the lineage of Brutus existed on the island.

Two hundred years after the initial rise, and growing prosperity, of this Trojan civilization in Britain, it was undone through attempted fratricide and successful filicide. Shortly after the foundation of Rome in Italy by Romulus and Remus, another pair of brothers in Britain, Ferrex and Porrex were required to figure out a succession when their father died early. To make a long story short, Porrex drove Ferrex out of England and to France where he gained control of an army to help him take back his throne. Ferrex returned and slayed Porrex, but was then betrayed by his mother, Videna, who “less lov’d him”. Videna killed Porrex in his sleep with the help of her maidens. With this uncivilized situation, Milton explained, “With whom ended, as in thought, the Line of Brutus. Wherupon, the whole Land with civil broils was rent into five Kingdoms, long time waging Warr each on other…” The island devolved into war until the coming of Julius Caesar and the Romans who restored order. By the same token, the light the Romans brought to the uncultured and warring Britons was demonstrated to the ancestors of the same, “By this time, like one who had set out on his way by night, and travail’d through a Region of smooth or idle Dreams, our History now arrives on the Confines, where day-light and truth meet us with a cleer dawn, representing our view, through at a far distance, true colours and shapes”. With the arrival of the Romans, British history reached a new realm, one that softened the fantastic and refocused on the factual.

107 Ibid, 11.
108 Ibid, 11.
109 Ibid, 11.
110 Ibid, 15.
Milton reinforced the preconceptions that existed from previous antiquarian research but added a fanciful narrative that made early Britain seem wilder and more uncultured. He was highly influential in both Britain and Europe and characterized an era of European cosmopolitanism that emphasized classical learning with a focus on textual evidence, from mostly Greek, and Roman sources. John Milton reinvigorated the mythological world Geoffrey of Monmouth created and reinforced the understanding of early Britons since antiquarian study started with John Leland. This factual façade paired with the fantastic origin myths created a strange combination for early British history, one that left that portion of history in the dark for both Britain and Europe. The fantastic account emphasized the backwardness of Britain before the Romans and the hapless nature of Britain’s ancestors without their famous conquerors. It created a powerful image of the early Britons in the mind of the modern English and the European upper class, which would be an image that offered a boon to the nationalist movement that began in the early 1700s.

The same antiquarian tendencies of Camden and Leland, and the historical tendencies of Milton did not end with them. The narratives set up by these three titans of English origins influenced the study of English history for many years after their respective deaths even as methodologies changed. A contemporary of Camden’s, Inigo Jones (1573-1652)\(^{111}\) tried his hand at a more focused, detailed English survey centered on Wiltshire. Jones was an architect who traveled specifically to Italy in the early

seventeenth century as he was meant to become the Surveyor to the King’s Works112. While he was in Italy, he studied and drew anything that caught his attention. Once he returned to England, he became interested in native architectural features, specifically Stonehenge. Ultimately, his son-in-law, John Webb, would publish a posthumous collection of Jones’s notes entitled Stone-heng. And while the focus on Stonehenge was commendable, Jones attributed the site’s construction to the Romans, believing that the Britons who lived on the island before the invasion were unable to build such a structure113. Both Jones and Webb saw the inner circle as hexagonal and the open-aired portion of the structure as a cella with the entirety of the structure described as symmetrical114. A.A. Tait made the point in his article Inigo Jones’s ‘Stone-heng’, that “In making this stylistic leap Jones and Webb were elevating to classical status what seemed to their contemporaries little more than a pile of stones…”115. This was true to an extent, while Jones’s and Webb’s work garnered attention, especially given Jones’s status as Surveyor to the King’s Works, it also created connections detrimental to the discovery of English origins. But attributing Stonehenge to the Romans furthered the perception that the pre-Roman Britons had little to offer and so any research into English culture and origins should start with the Romans. This left the early Britons as the warlike heathens that Milton described and drove attention away from non-literary sites that would have shed some light on early Britain.

115 Ibid, 155.
The last of the notable antiquarians to study England was John Aubrey from 1626-1697. Aubrey was known for his work on the sites of Avebury, which is mostly dismantled, and Stonehenge. The amount of time he spent working at these sites was apparent from the chalk pits that still retain the name “Aubrey holes” because the antiquarian was the first to sink holes into the foundation to explore the purpose of the site and discern who constructed it. While he uncovered some animal bone and other trash deposits, he only hazarded a guess at the original builders with a noncommittal point to the druids. While this is not quite as detrimental to the understanding of the site as Jones’s misidentification of Stonehenge’s builders, the inability of Aubrey to concretely point to a builder did nothing to dissuade attention from the conclusions of Jones. With little exception, this is the extent of the work written on British history and antiquities because most of the work published by the earliest credited antiquarians focused on land, religious sites, and law. As a whole, the gap in English history created by this focus left Britain a legacy whose definition relied on the Romans and later conquerors. The conquered narrative was paired with the immediate and substantial influence of Europe, specifically the countries of Italy and France, on the British intellectual elites, leaving little value to studying early English origins before the Romans.


117 There was one scholar, Dr. Charlton, around the time of Aubrey who suggested that the stone circles were created by the Danish, which we know to today, is an incorrect conclusion and at the time, Charlton’s work did not seem to garner much attention. William Stukeley, Stonehenge a Temple Restor’d to the British Druids. By William Stukeley, M.D. Rector of All Saints in Stamford (London: W. Innys and R. Manby, at the West End of St. Paul's, 1740), 3.

118 The Archaeologia detailed the works published by the earliest scholars considered antiquarians by the Society and in this summary, the majority of scholars focused on the formation of the land, types of soil, and religious history. Archaeologia Or, Miscellaneous Tracts Relating to Antiquity. Published by the Society of Antiquaries of London. Volume IV. Vol. 1. (London: Printed by J. Nichols, Printer to the Society; and Sold at Their Apartments in Somerset Place; and by Messieurs White, Robson, Leigh and Sotheby, and Brown, 1770), preface, 7-13.
since ostensibly there was none. Only those who considered themselves the most patriotic, or who were asked by other European intellectuals to study the subject, would take up the call.

**Conclusion**

The cosmopolitanism of the world informed the antiquarian focus but their manner of study became a necessary piece of British nationalism because the research had the ability to provide a history that allowed the British to fully embrace their self-styled position as the new Roman Empire. This history provided a way to talk about the differences between themselves and the Romans and so they became Roman in spirit while retaining a distinctly British culture. The antiquarians would provide the chronological and tangible understanding necessary to fulfill this identity, eventually, but it would take a refocusing of the discipline to do so. In 1717, the Society was reestablished, with a self-direction to fulfill the need for a,

…study of Antiquity, and the History of former times, has ever been esteemed highly commendable and useful, not only to improve the minds of men, but also to incite them to virtuous and noble actions, and such as may hereafter render them famous and worthy examples to late posterity: And whereas several of Our loving subjects, who have for several years last past met together, for their mutual improvement in such studies and inquiries, have humble besought Us to grant unto them, and such other as We should be pleased to join to them, Our Royal Charter of Incorporation, for the better carrying on the said purposes:…

In order to fully fulfill this task, a shift was needed in the research. The literate Romans were a necessary component but they could not fully write the origins of Britain; it would take evidence and understanding of the early Britons, paired with an understanding of the consequences of the relationship Britain had with the Romans and later invasions, to be

---

119 Thomas Bensley, *A copy of the royal charter and statutes of the Society of Antiquaries of London: and of orders and regulations established by the Council of the Society* (London: Printed by T. Bensley, Bolt Court, Fleet Street, 1815), 2.
uncovered but the framework constructed by these early antiquarians did not allow that research. A new approach was needed to explain all the components, and with that new approach would come a way to emphasize the importance of non-textual aspects of England.
CHAPTER 2

WILLIAM STUKELEY: THE FRAMEWORK FOR NATIONALISM AND THE BEGINNINGS OF ARCHAEOLOGY

As the seventeenth century progressed the nature of the interactions between the British and European elite changed incrementally. One of the most significant changes impacted the Grand Tour, because it became widely available to more English sons, which laid the groundwork for a crisis of English identity. The availability of the Tour moved the experience from the purview of the wealthy and educated, looking to practice their language skills and polish their manners, to a run of the mill trip every Englishman with a bit of money and some connections could make. This shift allowed more Englishmen to experience France and Italy, a sentiment William Bromley, a self-styled “person of quality”, emphasized when he felt the need to include a disclaimer in his “Remarks in the Grande Tour of France & Italy”. He explained,

For considering how many have with good Judgment, and great Accuracy described the Grande Tour, especially the Voyage of Italy, it may be believed nothing can here be super-added, and that these Observations are merely Transcripts, not new. To remove which Prejudice, this is to assure the Reader, Transcribing from others has been throughout studiously voided…

---
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If a vast body of literature about the Tour from those who had been on it did not exist, no reason would have existed for Bromley to include this disclaimer. It also would not have been necessary to mention that he studiously avoided transcribing from others, pointing to its legitimacy. This pointed to a large market in Tour travel guides because of the vehement insistence Bromley’s is truly accuracy and the apparent wealth of plagiarizing material for those who wanted to write without the travel.\footnote{This was reinforced by an appendix created by Anne Woodhouse in her PhD dissertation “English Visitors to Paris, 1650-1789” where she catalogued over 100 travel diaries. Anne F. Woodhouse, “Eighteenth-Century English Visitors to France in Fiction and Fact.” Modern Language Studies 6, no. 1 (1976): doi:10.2307/3194390, 40.}

However, there was a downside to Bromley’s experiences and the experiences of many like him: travel to these cultural locations led to an interesting phenomena characterized by Newman, “What was happening was that many English travelers, though increasingly inclined while traveling to depreciate lands which they neither really saw nor understood, dropped these critical attitudes on returning to England and there metamorphosed themselves into Frenchman”\footnote{Newman, 45.}. The returning travelers acted as Frenchmen on their return and because of the large number taking the trip, strengthening and democratizing the cosmopolitan bonds while interest in European history and culture continued to grow, even while conflicts with France were driving the growing patriotism of everyday Englishman\footnote{Colley, 5.}. The Francophile nature of returning British men was noticed, if not truly understood by contemporaries and the visibility of the issue pushed some intellectuals, one antiquarian in particular, to comment on, and attempt to combat, this trend.
Resisting this trend had a significant impact on the antiquarian tradition as scientific based exploration became increasingly important. In addition, the changes did provide justification for non-textual evidence as valid exploration, which shined a light into the mists of uncertainty and for the first time provided a history not dependent on the writings of an occupying power. This ultimately led to a strange dichotomy in British nationalism: the celebration of rebellious Britons who fought any conquerors while the country maintained the British Empire’s position as the reincarnation of the Roman Empire. This was the legacy of William Stukeley. In an attempt to return England to international intellectual standing Stukeley fulfilled the role of Newman’s artist-intellectual and was informed by the international pressures of Colley. Nationalism needed a spark and “this activity…is initially a cultural activity, though it may later take on political and other manifestations also”  

126. Stukeley wrote on the cultural deficiencies of Britain, providing the spark needed for the antiquarian study necessary for nationalism. Not only did his writing focus on England but also it afforded the country a history free of the fiction provided by the earliest antiquarians. He felt excluded from the British experience of travel and that caused him to look at the history of Britain from a different perspective, one that inadvertently provided England with a history not dependent on the Romans. Stukeley’s work provided insight into the importance of Britain to the English, including illuminating the original inhabitants of the island, or at least those who he imagined were the original inhabitants. Stukeley provided ancient Britons with a sense of honor and culture Caesar did not convey, as well as a sense of originality that did not depend on the Romans for its creation.

126 Ibid, 55.
All this being said, recent scholarship has not looked kindly on William Stukeley so, as well as showing the bridge he created between cosmopolitan antiquarians and later nationalist and archaeological researchers, this chapter endeavors to reinvigorate the value of this particularly interesting antiquarian. Much of the current criticism has grown from his later writings, which differed dramatically from his early scholarly works and delved further into the murky world of fiction and religion. Today, the conclusions he reached in those writings are laughable and more than a little confusing. Stuart Piggott wrote the original book on William Stukeley and described him as such,

Nothing comes out more strongly from a study of Stukeley’s life and work than the changed intellectual temper in England after about 1730…and with Stukeley we can find a parallel decline in antiquarian pursuits. He is all too significantly a child of his age, and his own intellectual history lives out the melancholy story of British learning at large. 127

However, when Piggott wrote the above remarks he weighed the accuracy of Stukeley’s conclusions as more significant than the distinctiveness of Stukeley’s academic method, ultimately dismissing his effect on later British learning. Through his unique implementation of archaeology, relying on physical artifacts and sites over textual evidence, and questioning the established origin of English culture, William Stukeley complicated the English chronology while encouraging his contemporaries and successors to explore it further. An exploration into the motivations of his scholarship provided an explanation for Piggott’s proclaimed “decline in intellectual pursuits” 128 as

128 Piggott emphasized the mistakes Stukeley started making in his later career like the association of the Druids with early Christianity and Hercules, and the authentication issues he had with a supposed manuscript by Richard of Cirencester, which turned out to be a well-done forgery that fooled all the period experts. The emphasis made it difficult to study Stukeley because it was this perception that lasted in modern scholarship. Ibid, 153.
well as informing the effectiveness of his legacy because the decline in scholarly work
saw a rise in the patriotic rhetoric that had already existed within his work.

Stukeley’s research provided an important truth for later English scholarship:
there was valuable erudition that stretched beyond the classical reaches of Greece and
Rome. Stukeley clearly laid out this goal in his first published work, *Itinerarium Curiosum*.

The whole is to invite gentlemen and others in the country, to make researches of
this nature, and to acquaint the world with them. they may be assur’d that
whatever accounts of this sort, they please to communicate to me, they shall be
apply’d to proper use, and all due honor paid to the names of those that favor me
with a correspondence so much to the glory and benefit of our country, which is
my sole aim therein.\(^{129}\)

It is important here to note the difference between Stukeley’s goal and the earlier
antiquarians because Stukeley did not write to Europe. His audience was British citizens
and intellectuals specifically, inviting them to share their country with the world.
Sparking a conversation about English antiquity was a trend throughout every era of his
work. And while this was not exclusive to him, Stukeley was the loudest and offered the
most evidence. Using a combination of legwork, measurements, and questioning,
Stukeley combatted the classical-inspired notions of the past and created a bridge that
brought the ancient Britons into the minds of his contemporaries and antiquarian history
into the Newtonian science of the age. It was, in part, because of the work of Stukeley
that dialogue about ancient British history began in earnest, which complicated the
understood narrative that English antiquity started with the Romans. On a broad scale,

this provided an origin for a country slowly building itself into the world’s premier empire.

William Stukeley became the bridge from the early antiquarians to the British-centric studies of the 18th and 19th centuries. He was a widely read and published scholar, who trained as a doctor, but wrote in a number of fields including the antiquarian, medical, architectural, landscape, religious, and political. His antiquarian writings will be the focal point here because he published exclusively on English sites and antiquity. This was a conscious choice for Stukeley, informed by his contention of the value of English scholarship. However, it is important to note, the initial watershed event that caused this choice was his forced tour of England when family debt prohibited him from taking the Grand Tour. This inconvenient fact had an irrevocable impact on how Stukeley viewed the lack of interest shown to England’s extant antiquity. This stimulated him to find ways to explain the value of England, and shame his contemporaries into studying their country by proving England was worth the study.

His most vocal protest centered around Britain’s portrayal in past scholarly works, and the negative effect this had on the learned classes, “Most writers and particularly Mr. Camden and most strangers have an injurious opinion of this country, and apply that to the whole which is true but of part of it, for in the main the land is admirable good, hard and dry”130. To Stukeley, this “injurious” mentality instilled by renowned scholars, drove intellectuals from England’s shores to experience culture in other countries, which left England at a disadvantage in international relations. To that end, Stukeley attempted to revalue Britain in the eyes of English scholars and, by extension, the rest of the world.

130 Ibid, 15.
He argued England had fallen behind, “the other learned nations in Europe”\textsuperscript{131} in simply understanding their own origins and antiquity, information that was vital to the development of future leaders. Stukeley called for a focus on academic knowledge of England because it provided the virtue and role models necessary for a full education,

It was ever my opinion that a more intimate knowledg of Brittan more becomes us, is more useful and as worthy a part of education for our young nobility and gentry as the view of any transmarin parts. And if I have learnt by seeing some places, men and manner, or have any judgment in things, ‘tis not impossible to make a classic journey on this side of the straits of Dover\textsuperscript{132}.

Stukeley stressed a neglected country, one forsaken by the immature nobility for places more interesting that resulted in a mixed view of the country to which they would inevitably return. Stukeley wanted contemporary scholars to appreciate England before traveling to the world beyond the White Cliffs. At the beginning of every published work, Stukeley emphasized that England contained enough antiquarian wealth to inform a budding scholar, and accentuated the uselessness of an education that did not involve English antiquaries. Stukeley wrote to change the opinion of the educated classes and narratives surrounding English antiquities.

The rationalization of better education and national value were not the only arguments for studying Britain. Stukeley recognized the value of the Romans to his contemporaries so he used the Romans to justify the English study of Britain. In \textit{The Medallic History of Carausius} he bluntly stated, “Lastly, the Romans. Their eloguim. Chose for their virtue to subdue the world. Brittain highly cherished by them”\textsuperscript{133}. The Romans, the culture English schoolboys studied and read about cherished the island

\textsuperscript{131} Ibid, 2.
\textsuperscript{132} Ibid, 3.
\textsuperscript{133} William Stukeley, \textit{The Medallic History of Marcvs Avrelivs Valerivs Caravsivs, Emperor in Brittain ... By William Stukeley} (London: Charles Corbet, Bookseller, 1757), 1.
enough to take the time to subdue it. Every English scholar knew the story of the Romans in Britain because Caesar’s De Bello Gallico was required reading material\textsuperscript{134}. In addition, Stukeley had antiquities on his side; the Romans constructed two major walls and maintained the island for hundreds of years throughout multiple uprisings, insurrections, and usurping generals. This was the fact Stukeley accentuated when he argued the Romans could have subdued the entire world but specifically chose England and spent enough time to thoroughly control what would become the southern island nation. This meant that compared to present scholars, these conquerors felt more affection and pride in owning Britain than those who claimed descent from that country. It highlighted the uselessness of traveling to the continent to study the Romans when it was possible to research them without leaving home. Stukeley stressed this point when he wrote, “‘Tis for the honor of our country that so many of these [Roman] inscriptions are found among us. It shows how well the Romans had settled themselves here, and how much they valued the settlement, though now our shittlecock heads think of nothing but France”\textsuperscript{135}. According to Stukeley, the Romans honored England by bringing their unique culture to English shores but English scholars were so impatient to get to the continent they could not recognize the implications of that honor. Her conquerors took better care of England than her sons, a metaphor for Stukeley’s perceived weakness of English scholarship.

Underlying the earlier motivations there was also a layer of shame. In a move normally reserved for nationalist writers, Stukeley consistently reiterated the sentiment

\textsuperscript{134} M. L. Clarke, Classical Education in Britain: 1500-1900 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 12.
that England was mother to these unappreciative young scholars. In an impassioned plea he wrote, “We export yearly our own treasures into foreign parts, by the genteel and fashionabl tours of France and Italy, and import ship-loads of books relating to their antiquitys and history…whilst our own country lies like a neglected province. Like untoward children we look back with contempt upon our own mother”\textsuperscript{136}. The intellects of England were drawn to the immediate gratification experienced in foreign places at the expense of the country that raised them. He maintained England was not devoid of the wonders these wandering scholars sought but instead that England was too well known to be a viable option. His best illumination of this point used cheese, “\textit{Stilton or Stickleton}, analogous to \textit{Stivecle}, is famous for cheese, which they fell at 12 d. per point, and would be thought equal to \textit{parmesan}, were it not too near us”\textsuperscript{137}. The antiquity that existed within England was worth studying but its familiarity made it undesirable. Stukeley criticized his contemporaries for hoping to find more antiquity or culture across the Channel. However, he was not saying travel was not necessary but that knowledge of home had to be mastered before a trip abroad could be beneficial to the learned classes.

While some have argued Stukeley wrote in this way to drum up interest in his own work, even Gerald Newman in \textit{The Rise of English Nationalism} described the reality of foreign influence altering the opinions of English gentlemen,

…young Englishmen were affecting to be French, and partly ceasing to be English. What was happening was that many English travellers, though increasingly inclined while traveling to depreciate lands, which they neither really saw nor understood, dropped these critical attitudes on returning to England and these metamorphosed themselves into Frenchmen\textsuperscript{138}.

\textsuperscript{136} Stukeley, \textit{Itinerarium Curiosum}, 3.
\textsuperscript{137} Ibid, 77.
\textsuperscript{138} Newman, 45.
Various scholars noticed this particularity and given Stukeley’s paranoia of the international power of the French\textsuperscript{139} it would be hard to argue his ignorance of the reality. This paranoia, given its presence in personal letters as well as published works, belied the idea that Stukeley was criticizing his contemporaries simply to drive up interest in his work. And Colley pointed out, given the wars fought between Britain and France in the seventeenth century, worry about French culture and power was not out of the ordinary\textsuperscript{140}. If anything Stukeley’s goal was to combat the French by driving interest in Britain in general because the study of England negated some of the returning metamorphosis, and it was the study of antiquity he meant when he stated, “‘tis to be wished this branch of learning should revive among us, which has lain dormant since the great Camden: so that either in discoursing on it or journeying, we might find some entertainment worthy of men of letters”\textsuperscript{141}. Stukeley pushed for a revival of native history to strengthen an understanding of Britain but also return a bit of attention to a country he saw as the victim of neglect. The desire to provide value to England’s history permeated his work and informed his methods, leading him to provide his most important contribution to English antiquity, starting a conversation on the nuance of British antiquity.

However, the projection of value was not enough to verify it actually existed. In order to do so, Stukeley needed to prove it through research. He achieved this in a distinct way. Instead of relying on the traditional methods of classical authors and

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{139} There is a worry of France that works its way through Stukeley’s work. In his Family Memoirs he referred to the French as the “enemy” and continuously worries about the aggressions of the French military in the Seven Years’ War. Including the French enticing the Scottish to invade England on multiple occasions. Stukeley, William, W. C. Lukis, Roger Gale, Samuel Gale, and Godfrey Kneller. The Family Memoirs, 336.
\textsuperscript{140} Colley, 6.
\textsuperscript{141} Stukeley, Itinerarium Curiosum, 32-33.
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second hand stories, Stukeley relied on tangible evidence. He traveled to each site he wrote about but more than that; he took measurements of the entirety of the site and detailed individual elements. He paid attention to the site’s interaction with the landscape and interpreted the flow of the site. This keen eye allowed him to effectively lay out various phases as well as place disparate artifacts closer to their correct context. While he did succumb to flights of fantasy in his later publications, his early works looked similar to the work of archaeologists today, making it possible to name Stukeley a proto-archaeologist\textsuperscript{142}. His skills gave him a way to tangibly prove England’s worth in a time obsessed with Newtonian science.

Stukeley travelled England, exploring sites that held interest for him. This resulted in multiple publications in which he details what, “…will appear a novelty to most people, when we shall talk of such curious antiquitys of Britain”\textsuperscript{143}. Stukeley commented extensively on sites along the Roman roads that crisscrossed England. His first publication on these travels was \textit{Itinerarium Curiosum}, in which he included personal analysis of various sites. He reexamined many areas thought to be Roman and explained sites from a different perspective and with a unique type of evidence in mind. For example, his conclusion that the barrows cut through by Roman roads were older because the roads cut through them is an observation that makes sense today but was not prevalent at the time because of the pervasive assumption that Roman works were the oldest. However, tangible and visual observation led to those conclusions utilizing a

\textsuperscript{142} The title of proto-archaeologist has not been previously attributed to Stukeley or any scholar. However, I feel given the influence that Stukeley had and the pioneering methods he had at Stonehenge, Avebury, and other historic sites, he deserves a type of recognition along the lines of archaeologist although he never was formally one. Flinders Petrie holds the title of “Father of Archaeology” because of his honed archaeological instincts and techniques but Stukeley used similar techniques in his early work.

\textsuperscript{143} Stukeley, \textit{Itinerarium Curiosum}, 155.
unique type of evidence, the reality of the location. Many of Stukeley’s observations stemmed from his interest in architecture and botany\textsuperscript{144} and these were two skills that when combined with an antiquarian eye, provided a wider understanding of the impact of design.

It was because of this combination of skills that he was the first to note the major avenue leading to Stonehenge, an architectural feature forgotten for thousands of years but important to comprehend the larger structure. This avenue is still studied today as archaeologists continue to unlock secrets to that centuries’ old puzzle. Stukeley’s architectural training provided him with more than a way to visualize the avenue; it gave him a method of recording because he drew the route to scale for the first time allowing for numerically supported conclusions. But he did not simply copy the route; he drew every image of Stonehenge and Avebury to an accurate measurement. This became invaluable because his evidence could be corroborated and replicated, demonstrating the scientific value of conclusions drawn from physical evidence which allowed for compelling arguments that varied dramatically from the understood, yet under-researched, timeline of antiquity. Stukeley’s use of physical sites confused the narrative of antiquarians, merging the traditionally literature based antiquarian studies with the scientific tenants of observation and measurement.

Stonehenge was Stukeley’s most successful example of proto-archaeological practice. From 1721-1724, Stukeley examined the site, resulting in pages of measurements and calculations paired with scaled sketches drawn for an accurate idea of the extant layout of the site. This research was recorded in an early, unpublished book on Stonehenge before a version was published in 1740, entitled \textit{Stonehenge: A Temple}

\textsuperscript{144} Stukeley, \textit{The Family Memoirs}, 16-17.
Restor’d to the British Druids. The unpublished work included his comprehensive notes, which were omitted from the later publication; however, earlier observations supported the conclusions throughout both works. Stukeley’s careful examination of the site gave him an idea of how each stone related to the others and how the whole tied into the landscape. He expressed this idea numerically before forming a conclusion. The more detailed, unpublished work was filled with entries along these lines,

For without dispute the round form was the first of the Temples. Of this outer circle which has in its perfection consisted of threescore stones 30 uprights & 30 architraves, are 17 uprights left standing one toward the southwest end leans upon a [pyramidal, deleted] one there are 6 more lying upon the Ground whole or in pieces. Of the [Architraves, deleted] there are by 6 in their proper places & but two lying upon the ground so that there are no less than 22 of them carried off145.

This brief recording demonstrated his recognition of the multiple phases of Stonehenge, which we know today to be accurate since it was not constructed in one project146; it was instead constructed over multiple projects and hundreds of years. Stukeley recognized this when he mentioned the round temple as the first of the temples, which implied an understanding of site stages.

The physical site became the supplier of evidence and, while Stukeley used knowledge of similar round temples to help fill in missing pieces, he pulled the bulk of his evidence directly from the site. In addition, it was these carefully collected statistics that allowed him to disprove traditional claims about Stonehenge. After concluding his survey, he applied the factual evidence to the origin thesis provided by Inigo Jones and his student, John Webb147.

145 Stukeley, Stukeley’s ‘Stonehenge’, 46.
Whence only I fish’d out their true number…which is very ill represented in Jones’s schemes, for to favor his Roman fashion he has set them opposite to each upright of the outer circle & consequently made their number equal to those being 30. But utterly repugnant to reality, there are 5 in one place standing contiguous, three in another, 2 in another which sufficiently overthrow that notion…But then M’ Webb conscious that supposing this to be as he would have it, yet would scarce be able to persuade people that the Romans in making a Portico would have the pillars on one side 10 times less that those on the other…  

The physical evidence of Stonehenge did not support the traditional conclusions, meaning the evidence used to create that incorrect hypothesis was lacking. The Romans did not construct temples on the blueprint of Stonehenge, a fact Stukeley knew despite never travelling to Rome, further evidence for the argument that it was unnecessary to leave Britain to get a classical education. Stukeley also implied Jones and Webb forced the evidence to fit their foregone conclusion. The physical evidence Stukeley provided contradicted the conclusion of Roman construction or even influence, and by extension, the stereotype of the uncultured Britons by proving through physical evidence the Romans were not the builders of this major site.

However, Stukeley did not stop with the physical evidence. Turning to the renowned astronomer, Dr. Edmund Halley, Stukeley commissioned him to date the site and complete the requisite calculations to establish a timeframe for Stonehenge. Halley used variations of the earth’s revolution to put the age of Stonehenge at about 400 years before Jesus’s birth, based on the earth’s age of 6,000 years. By the same calendar,

---
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Diviticus, the first Druid mentioned by name in Caesar’s *De Bello Gallico*\(^{151}\), arrived in England 479 years before Jesus’s birth. Diviticus was credited by Stukeley with the building of barrows associated with the Druids, because according to the antiquarian’s calculations, there was no way for the barrows to be built up in less than 100 years and since they were mentioned by the Romans, they had to already exist. In addition, the time period implied the druids were there well before Stonehenge was constructed, giving them a claim to its creation\(^{152}\). So Caesar, who noted the barrows, could not have arrived in England less than 100 years after Diviticus, meaning the Romans had no way of influencing the assembly of Stonehenge, let alone constructing it. While this is questionable dating today, it was supported by the accepted time frame of the period and set up the scientific basis for Stukeley’s arguments. More importantly, it restarted the conversation of the identity of the builders. Given the evidentiary dismissal of Jones’ sources, it proved there was more required then literary research to unravel the truth, making the physical site more valuable.

With the Romans pushed out as a contender for the construction of Stonehenge, Stukeley provided his own builders in *Stonehenge a temple restor’d to the British Druids*, “But ‘tis my intent to begin my discourse from it, because the latest, and from thence proceed upwards in our inquiries, about the times and authors of these stupendous works, the temples of the Druids in our Island: for I cannot doubt that *Stonehenge* was such”\(^{153}\). He established that the original Britons were Druids, descended from the Hebrews and the carriers of the “true religion”\(^{154}\). While this is where many modern scholars dismiss

\(^{151}\) Caesar, I, 3, 5-7.
\(^{152}\) Ibid, 52.
\(^{153}\) Ibid, 1.
\(^{154}\) Ibid, 3.
him, and rightly so, Stukeley’s logic made sense given Halley’s dating of Stonehenge and the accepted timeframe from Noah’s Flood. In addition, it is important to note that he gave the British an origin not dependent on the Continent, providing a native origin point for a growing empire. The re-dating of Stonehenge and Avebury provided logically argued proof that a civilization older than the Romans had existed on the island. This was not simply someone supplying a theory; Stukeley used the physical sites to procure independently testable evidence while also proving evidence existed on English soil.

The singular site of Stonehenge was not the only place that benefitted from this focus on the physical site, it changed the way Stukeley read the landscape, which became a trend in his scholarship. Throughout his travels, Stukeley made multiple references to instances where the Romans cut through older structures,

Beyond Bekhamton it [Roman road] again enters the downs, and marches up the hill in a very plan ridg and beautiful to behold; the pits and cavitys whence the earth was taken on both sides, being conspicuous all the way. Besides, the romans have defac’d a druids barrow, and another celtic one near, which sav’d ‘em some labor. a proof they were there before the roman road.

Recognizing the movement of earth in this way provided a logical argument for the age of the phenomena in question. If the observed remains were cut through another, it made sense that the site that was scarred was older. This understanding of site phasing is a simple observation today but earlier writers overlooked it, forcing the knowledge of pre-Roman cultures farther into the background. Stukeley embraced these observations and paired them with physical remains, “They [barrows] are generally of a very considerable
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155 With this in mind, it is important to point out that even this origin was dependent on the Near East but this earliest migration into the island was dependent on Biblical migrations not the conquering of the kingdoms of men.
156 Stukeley, *Itinerarium Curiosum*, 133.
157 This is an established practice in archaeology today in terms of dating the phases of a site or location. In modern archaeology, this relies on observation but is corroborated by dating techniques like carbon dating.
bulk, much too large for Romans, nor has anything Roman been discovered in cutting them through”\textsuperscript{158}. If nothing Roman was found within the burials, it was impossible to argue the Romans built them and if the Romans cut them through to create roads, it made it difficult to argue the Romans constructed the roads first.

In addition, the existence of burial mounds spoke to a culture among their creators, traditionally the reason for burials. Stukeley tied these burials to Stonehenge via the Druids, further fleshing out the druidic culture he increasingly recognized for constructing English sites. Practically, he also demonstrated the importance of site phasing to those who would study these sites after him and emphasized the importance of more than one type of evidence. For example, traditionally the presence of Roman coins established a site as Roman, and while that made sense superficially, it was rarely the full story. Either because of natural skepticism or because of his noted existence of an older culture, Stukeley questioned the established dating of sites, even as early as his first antiquarian publications. While traveling, he commented on a Roman camp, “North of Baldoc we visited the camp of Ashwel taken notice of in Camden, called Harbury banks, ‘tis of a theatrical form, consisting wholly of an agger. Tho’ roman coyns have been found in it, I am inclined to think ‘tis earlier then their times”\textsuperscript{159}. Unfortunately, Stukeley did not explicitly explain the earlier times in regards to the Harbury Banks site but he used this same skepticism at later sites. While at Fleet Haven, Stukeley commented on nails and coins discovered in the mud, “Mr. Lenton found some shiptimber upon it with rusty nails, probably of some Roman barge. None of these coyns were lower than the

\textsuperscript{158} Ibid, 5-6.
\textsuperscript{159} Ibid, 74.
Tetrici, which proves the imbankation was made before their time. Using the location of the coins, nails, and timber in the mud, he argued the Romans only utilized the canal, pointing to an earlier origin and builder.

Stukeley’s innovative practice of collecting measurements, drawing detailed plans, and deriving conclusions from the actual sites, was a boon to English origins. Only through this comprehensive work was it possible to suggest there had been peoples in Britain long before the Romans, and more importantly, that they had a definable culture. It turned the island from a stronghold of Roman culture into a place with its own originating culture. It made exploring sites a vital practice, but also pointed out the flaws in traditional sources of information. If the classical authors did not talk about the culture, it was difficult to understand it from extant sources, leaving the reality shrouded in mystery. This missing information influenced the ideas of antiquarians and historians, since the classics of Greece and Rome provided the backbone of English scholarship and schooling.

Caesar featured predominantly throughout this changing methodology because of the trust placed in his descriptions of the earliest experience with the Britons. Specifically, Caesar provided the Britons with their previously mentioned warlike and uncultured description but in a slightly more obscure instance connected the Britons with the mysterious Druids. This mysterious and often dangerous class of people recorded nothing and encouraged the maintenance of the oral and supposedly, barbaric life the Britons had lived for the extant of their culture. As mentioned above, this was not an ancestry the British wanted and when added to the contemporary comparison of British to
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French culture and history, taking time to study ancestors who behaved this way was undesirable, driving the English away from their indigenous origins. However, Stukeley overcame this deficiency, using physical evidence to supplement, or contradict the classical sources. For Stukeley, Roman sources become a piece of the puzzle but not the final authority,

> Here are the things themselves to study upon, not words only, wherein too much of learning has consisted. If we examin into the antiquities of nations that had no writing among them, here are their monuments, these we are to explore, to strike out their latent meaning, and the more we reason upon them, the more reason shall we find to admire the vast size of the gigantic minds of our predecessors: the great and simple majesty of their works, and wherein mainly lyes the beauty and excellence or matters of antiquity.”

The predecessors of the English did not write but that did not mean their culture did not exist. Stukeley pushed for a new view of English history that valued those who built the stunning sites extant in England because it proved those people had constructed a unique culture separate from the Romans and that idea, paired with Halley’s dating ensured the construction was not even influenced by the later conquerors. This provided England with a history the classical texts could not explain. Throughout his writings, the Romans were the conquerors of an older civilization; one the Romans mentioned as mysterious, so Stukeley’s implication was that if even the Romans could not understand them, these ancient Britons had been a significant culture. But because of their lack of writing, there was only one way to understand them, using the physical remains. This was where previous scholars had fallen short; they took the classical word at face value, leading to the neglect of the ancient Britons. For Stukeley, written sources became supporting, not primary evidence.

---

In addition to showing the weakness of relying on classical literature, Stukeley played up the prestige, imagined or otherwise, of the physical sites. He endeavored to make the vision of these sites magnificent to combat the draw of places like Rome, Venice, and Paris. The physical sites become the embodiment of British history and by imbuing their importance to the rest of the academic community; Stukeley proved there was value in English antiquity. Stonehenge, as an iconic site, was a major focus of Stukeley’s compliments. His treatise on Stonehenge opened with the plea for Peregrine, Duke of Ancaster and Kesteven, “To accept of this attempt to illustrate one of the noblest antiquities now left upon earth”\textsuperscript{163}. This is a bold claim to make to a learned group of people bombarded by antiquarian reports from Pompeii, Herculaneum, and other Roman sites. However, the intrepid proto-archaeologist continued in his justification of importance, “And we may with reason conclude; there was somewhat very extraordinary in these principles, which prompted them [Druids] to such as noble spirit as produced these works, still visible with us, which for grandeur, simplicity, and antiquity, exceed any of the European wonders”\textsuperscript{164}. In this short sentence, Stukeley put Stonehenge on the same level as the legendary Greek and Roman sites many scholars had grown up studying. But in an effort to underscore the point, this was not even the boldest claim he would make. That would come in his unpublished book when he described Stonehenge to his reader, “You will be apt to despise the Pyramids or the Obelisks of Egypt which tho’ great yet are of simply dimensions, you will reckon Stonehenge a collection of

\textsuperscript{163} Stukeley, \textit{Stonehenge a Temple Restor’d}, preface, 1; The plea went on to make Peregrine, a hereditary lord, into the type of nobleman Stukeley approved of, because he demonstrated a love of God and country. They also seem to have been friends or acquaintances given that Stukeley wrote, “After the honour I have enjoyed of having been long known to your Grace…” ibid, iv. There is no other explanation for the dedication other than Peregrine’s character and connection to Stukeley.

\textsuperscript{164} Ibid, 2.
wonders, Seven in One”\textsuperscript{165}. He placed the monument of Stonehenge well above the Pyramids and the Seven Wonders of the World. That was a tall claim to make but it forced the reader to pause and seriously question the importance of Stonehenge as well as the other English sites, exactly Stukeley’s goal.

However, this prestige was not exclusive to pre-Roman sites, it extended to all British sites, including contributions from the Danish, Saxons, and Romans. Hadrian’s Wall, Rome’s strongest northernmost border\textsuperscript{166} that stood for a few hundred years, was an oft-repeated recipient of Stukeley’s praise. Emperor Hadrian built the Wall around 128 CE, a fact Stukeley took into account when he proposed, “This work [Hadrian’s Wall] is worthily called the greatest glory of his reign, I add, of the Roman Empire”\textsuperscript{167}. Hadrian’s Wall was an impressive site and while it might arguably have been the greatest glory of Hadrian’s reign, it was not the greatest glory of the Roman Empire. But much like the grandiose claims made about Stonehenge, it forced the reader to contemplate the under reported worth of that site. In addition, if the Romans were willing to build, even arguably, their greatest glory in England it begs the question, why was no one studying it? This was the type of question scholars loved to answer. This claim had an additional effect; it provided an incentive to preserve the site. Neglect had left even Roman sites to crumble, something Hadrian’s Wall had not escaped, as evidenced by major chipping and missing pieces of the wall\textsuperscript{168}. Stukeley explained this decay grew out of the slim, intellectual focus on the sites, which in turn devalued British history, leaving the country to continue to export its best and brightest. By exaggerating the prestige of the sites,

\textsuperscript{165} Stukeley, \textit{Stukeley’s ‘Stonehenge’}, 17.
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Stukeley combatted their devaluation, giving them historical context and forcing scholars to ask questions.

Ultimately, this prestige translated to all of England, “I shall begin with what I observed in my tour about it, and proceed to my more western perambulation, thro’ a country pregnant of antiquities, and the greatest curiosities in the world”169. England was rife with historical remains, some the greatest in the world and this claim drew attention to the possibilities wasted by wandering, negligent scholars. One of Stukeley’s most dramatic examples of English wealth was in Hedington, “The inhabitants are not surpriz’d when you inquire for antiquitys, they assert it to have been a very old and great city. infinit quantitys of antiquitys are found here, handfuls of coyns brought home every time they plow, and the streets and foundations of houses found for a great length, sufficiently evidence it”170. The implication was the study of English antiquity should be second nature to all Englishmen. If plowing the ground turned up handfuls of coins but none of it was studied, the blessed state of England was wasted. However, these unstudied artifacts and sites worked for two arguments. They showed the wealth but also strengthened Stukeley’s accusation of neglect, an even more repugnant situation given his characterization of Britain as, “The antient Albion, the valiant Brittain, the renowned England, big with all the blessings of indulgent nature, fruitful in strengths of genius, in the great, the wise, the magnanimous…”171. This was the England Stukeley envisioned and tried to convince others to study. He stressed the value of the country, which raised questions and influenced later scholars and authors to explore their homeland.

169 Stukeley, Itinerarium Curiosum, 127.
171 Ibid, 3.
While he did propagate the importance of pre-Roman Britain, and influenced the next generation of scholars to do so, his penultimate goal was to proliferate British prestige and importance. Stonehenge allowed for the reworking of pre-Roman origins, but Roman Britain offered a way to explore Britain’s stature through the eyes of a culture his contemporaries knew well. One of the best examples of this consideration and an exemplar of the status Stukeley argued for, was the Roman Marcus Aurelius Valerius Carausius. Toward the end of his life, Stukeley wrote the lengthy, *The Medallic History of Marcus Aurelius Valerius Carausius, Emperor in Brittain* to explore the life of a late stage usurping emperor. The Frenchman Dr. Genebrier was the first to study Carausius in a set of writings, which Stukeley supposedly did not read in order to maintain his own unique ideas about the emperor but Stukeley was the first Englishman to study him.  

Carausius was the perfect case study for Stukeley to prove the worth of the Britons both before and after the Romans, and he began his book with a patriotic message,

> What I here propose, is an important instance of the power of Brittain, under proper counsel, and the favor of Providence; as to its natural and naval strength. at this time, it was only the force of that part of it we call England. but then, for ten years together, it was able to withstand the whole effort of the Roman empire by sea; was mistress of all the coast of Gaul, Spain and the mediterranean: this when the empire was in the height of its greatness, under Diocletian and Maximian, two subtle, active, and warlike princes.

For the sake of understanding this small paragraph, it is necessary to point out the flaws in his characterization. First, the Empire was not at the height of its power, land mass was arguable but power was incorrect, Diocletian was the emperor who famously split the Empire into four quadrants because it was too large to be governed by one ruler. And while this action shored up the centralized power of the Emperor, by the time of
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Diocletian’s death it was apparent the cracks had only been puttied, not sealed. However, even with these major misconceptions, this introduction served a purpose. Carausius learned to harness the natural power and providence of England before using it to hold off various incursions from the empire, thereby confirming the natural state of English dominance, dominance that the country could get back to if it would just take the time to understand its own worth and origins. In addition, Stukeley made the final claim that solidified not only English value but also their modern right to take the position of the Romans, Carausius was a Briton. The true value of the story of Carausius was in its ability to accentuate the points Stukeley made throughout his academic life as well as allow him to offer a background for the inherent value of Britain.

Stukeley wrote *The Medallic History*, well after his more controversial claims about the Druids had taken shape. Carausius was an important character for Stukeley because he characterized the raw value of Britain, his perceived defamation by the Romans only reinforced the importance of non-textual sources, and he researched the entire story without leaving Britain. While some of the information about the usurping emperor’s early years came from a forged source, namely Richard of Circester’s *Ancient Map of Roman Brittain; and the Itinerary thereof*, which meant much of the factual story was not to be trusted, the majority of the work was written with corroboration of cabinet collections of coins. The legacy of Carausius was important because of the major themes while modern historians have largely corrected the specific information. In the context of the volume *The Medallic History*, Stukeley wrote what he thought to be truth and that was the information that made its way into the narrative. However, before looking at how Stukeley used Carausius, it is necessary to understand why this essentially...
throwaway Emperor, by Roman standards, was such a significant person in Stukeley’s research.

For the most part, the history was written from the coins minted during Carausius’s seven-year emperorship in Britain but there were elements of a researched history before the emperorship that Stukeley summarized in the first chapter. This provided the reader with a glimpse of the character of the subject of the volume. The key reason for Stukeley’s interest was laid out in the first sentence of the first substantial timeline entry, “Carausius, then a young man, was born in *Brittain*; he also served there under him [Probus, Emperor of Rome from 276-282 BCE], with reputation, by both sea and land”\(^{175}\). According to Stukeley, Carausius served under both Probus and Carus II in Gaul where he distinguished himself and gained “the greatest esteem among the military men”\(^{176}\). From even these two short entries, it was possible to see the man Stukeley was describing, but it was external events, not character, that shaped his situation. Eventually, Carus died and Diocletian and Maximian took over the Emperorship after some fighting amongst eligible contenders. This unrest allowed Carausius to come into his own, a consequence of breeding as much as skill, Stukeley wrote,

Carausius was born at the city in Wales now called St. David’s. We learn from the excellent manuscript of Richard of Cirencester’s *Britannia Romana*, that the ancient name of this place was Menapia. He was sprung of the old British blood-royal: of a graceful personage, and fine understanding. He was much conversant in marine affairs, and had give many proofs of value, and conduct, both by sea and land\(^{177}\).

From the beginning of his historic rise to power, Carausius was equally vital to the characterization of contemporary Britain’s rise. He was of royal-blood, giving him the
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justification necessary to rule an Empire based in Britain. His usurpation also put Britain front and center in a contestation for the throne of the Roman Empire. This exemplified the importance of the Roman legacy in Britain while also demonstrating the inherent power and value of Britain herself.

After the victory of Diocletian and Maximian, the latter coemperor arrived in Gaul, a territory Carausius had held for the two emperors. According to Stukeley, Maximian described Carausius as, “a person of great character, and influence in the army, and that he had in no ways favor’d Carinus. he, beside his former post, honors him with a captain’s command…”178. This was also the point where Carausius took up one of the most quintessentially English honors, control of the seas179. While this was not an extraordinary assignment to a Roman, especially one who needed to traverse the English Channel, to control his assigned provincia, it had significant meaning to early modern and modern Englishmen180. Stukeley’s multiple references to naval power demonstrated this importance, including the time he spent on Carausius’s elevation to praefect of the Roman Navy181. It is with this position that Carausius gained significant renown, enough so that Maximian became jealous and took his opportunity staging an attempted assassination of Carausius before sending his famous Theban legion against Carausius’s troops in Germany. In true poetic justice, the incursion failed as Carausius rallied large numbers of commanders who owed him allegiance and defeated Maximian’s greed and
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jealousy. Maximian’s malicious betrayal coupled with this defeat, led the legions and commanders of Gaul and Britain to hail Carausius as emperor. They followed him and the navy into Britain and solidified Carausius’s bid for imperial control.

This betrayal of a competent and loved commander by a malicious emperor had a two-pronged affect: it set up the antithesis of Carausius in character and demonstrated the necessity for Britain to rely on Britons. This was why after landing in Britain, Carausius was greeted with, “The eagerness with which the Britons received this their noble countryman, now their prince, may well be seen by those extraordinary coins struck this time, testifying their extreme impatience, and which hastened and confirmed his resolution to assume the purple”\(^{182}\). The ancient Britons were ready for the British to lead because they had chafed under the burden of Roman influence, a call or a warning for the current Englishmen Stukeley saw as under the influence of yet another continental power. However, the Britons had been ready for some time, as there had been some uprisings in Britain that Carausius used to his advantage. But to read Stukeley’s version, the British were looking for an emperor and, “court[ed] their brave countryman to rule over them; whose wisdom, valor, humanity, and magnanimous spirit at the time, the whole western world rung of”\(^{183}\). Carausius became the answer to the neglect of the Romans, because he returned the island to the Britons. It was not difficult to tie the importance of Carausius’s origins to his rise and point to the worth of Englishmen paying attention to England.

As Carausius gained traction in England, Maximian was determined to destroy him by attacking the coast of Britain, but Carausius bested him. This resulted in a deal
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struck between the three emperors, which made Carausius a joint emperor with Diocletian and Maximian, each ruling their own third of the Empire. After this point, according to the narrative, Carausius quickly improved the conditions in of his chunk of the Empire. For example, he restructured representation within a province that had longed to rebel, repaired neglected structures, like a dike in York necessary to water the corn crop, and brought security and quiet to his territories through expeditions into Scotland that ended with an alliance between the Britons, Scots, and Picts. All of this was done under the auspices of a British Emperor in the Roman Empire, a significant source of pride for an antiquarian who wanted to drive home the importance of England. In addition to being a justification for the calls in his itinerary to study English antiquities, the story of Carausius made Britain a centerpiece to both Roman and British history.

Ultimately, the story of Carausius was a tragic one, because both Diocletian and Maximian were “maliciously set against him”. This malice, while crucial to the story as Stukeley told it, was probably more reflective of the rebellious nature of Britain. While Carausius was painted as the emperor appointed through fate, it was more likely that in the Roman mind he was another pretender to the throne, a legionary leader raised up in one of the providences, a common problem throughout Rome’s history. From that perspective, the co-emperors were not expressly plotting against him as an emperor but against him as a usurper. However, within the narrative, Carausius was aware of this malice after Diocletian and Maximian met in Milan in 293 CE where they adopted
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Constantius Chlorus and Galerius Armentarius. The two men were married into their respective adoptive families, which cemented an order of succession without the input or presence of the third emperor\textsuperscript{187}. This action was designed to insulate the empire from Carausius’s influence and betrayed the Roman view of him as a pretender.

It was after their sons were adopted that the emperors made their move. Chlorus specifically moved against Carausius because he knew Britain, “having married a British woman of royal blood”\textsuperscript{188}. The choice of Chlorus specifically because of his wife reinforced the idea that understanding Britain was the only way to conquer the British territory. In order to ensure success, while Chlorus marched against Britain, Maximian agitated the tribes beyond the Rhine to invade, which failed when they engaged Carausius’s well-trained troops. Attacks repulsed, Carausius, betrayed and insulted, took the fight into the Mediterranean, sailing down the coast of Spain and striking at ports along \textit{Mare Nostrum}. However, when Carausius returned to Britain a member of his inner circle, Allectus, murdered him, according to the historian Nennius\textsuperscript{189}. Thus ended the reign of Carausius but Stukeley could not leave it at that, instead he emphasized the strength of the structures set up by Carausius in his comparatively short reign in Britain,

there’s enough to show the genius of our hero Carausius, who maintained his empire in \textit{Brittann, seven years, to his death}. Allectus, a mean a wicked man, kept it three years longer; by the strength, and posture of affairs in which Carausius left it. it requires time, for a great nation to be overturn’d, even in weak hands\textsuperscript{190}. 

Even after the death of Carausius, Allectus was able to maintain control for another three years because of the strength the original British emperor had left him with. But Allectus’s rule eventually fell and the Romans reincorporated Britain before abandoning
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it in the 400s CE. Nevertheless, for Stukeley, the memory of “our emperor” was symbolic of the importance and power of the island he implored the educated to study. His volume was not just a narrative but a microcosm of everything he was trying to prove throughout his academic life.

The title, *The Medallic History* betrayed the source material for the research and followed the trend Stukeley started early in his career when he stated, “I trust what I have wrote will furnish us with a method of viewing antient medals, in a new light”\(^{191}\). His goal in writing seemed to be twofold; tell the story of Carausius and further the study of numismatics. This use of coins dovetailed into the trend of collecting that had swept across the English wealthy since the seventeenth century\(^{192}\) and demonstrated the academic value of the collections. Given the sources of this history, Stukeley called on collectors and academics to thoroughly explore physical collections with the same keen eyes they reserved for their library,

> A cabinet of coins is a necessary part of the furniture of the library, of a person of taste, and learning. Whilst I here endeavor to be assist therein, I presume I am serving the public. And in a country, and an age of learning and curiosity, where we have so many very excellent Cabinets, both public and private, it well becomes us to assist, in obtaining a proper knowledge of them; looking upon them as so many classes of manuscripts most worthy of perusal and explanation\(^{193}\).

Instead of simply collecting the coins found in large hoards across the country, Stukeley argued for the analysis of them. It paired well with his earlier arguments for the use of monuments and structures, and the story of Carausius specifically validated their ability to explain a situation with no other trustworthy sources. Essentially, the coins that formed the background of his research were originally used as props to demonstrate
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learning and wealth, not for their antiquarian value. However, the Carausius story needed the evidence of the coins because of the distinct lack of recognition by extant Roman sources. In a practical sense, it also made the history more accessible because of the excess of public and private collections that were open to perusal by almost anyone. In citing the cabinets of no less than one hundred influential Lords, doctors, reverends, and private individuals, Stukeley demonstrated the ubiquitous nature of these sources and by extension the ridiculousness of not utilizing them.

Stukeley not only verified the importance of the sources, he also used them as a backbone to his research, “This chapter and the following is but an abstract of his history, deducible from the coins; as it were a model of a larger work, wherein the particular proofs are insisted on, sufficiently copious, and prolix; where necessary only”.

Starting in 288 CE, the year Carausius took outright control of Britain by defeating Maximian in Boulogne; Stukeley’s sources became the coins found throughout the various collections in Britain. The images, Brittanía holding the mercurial staff and the Emperor wearing the laurel wreath as a symbol of his authority were pervasive and all bore the providence of Britain for their creation. In a particularly uncommon one, found in the Bodleian library, Brittanía held hands with the Carausius and bore the production mark R.S.R., Rutupii Signata Roga, which Stukeley interpreted as near the current city Sandwich, a location choice reinforced by the remains of a Roman castrum and walls. This coin revealed evidence hammered almost 1500 years before and
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demonstrated the relationship Carausius built in Britain, by boasting his relationships and achievements through the currency. *Britannia* was not a coincidence, like all other Roman emperors, this imagery illustrated the welcoming the province gave to its new emperor and the production mark ensured it was not a coin coming from any mint in the Empire. This was printed for the sake of the Britons.

However, this was where Stukeley’s argument hit an academic bump, but one that still suited his purpose of British exceptionality. While the coins provided evidence for each of the various eras of Carausius’s control, they could not reliably provide a characterization of the attitude of the Britons, but that did not stop Stukeley from taking the imagery at face value, “The eagerness with which the Britons received this their noble countryman, now their prince, may well be seen by those extraordinary coins stuck about this time, testifying their extreme impatience, and which hastened and confirmed his resolution to assume the purple”\(^{199}\). The number of coins and the imagery were probably not indicative of the British mentality given the tradition of creating a flood of coins at the beginning of a new reign, since it was traditionally a good idea to reward those who backed a new emperor. However, it did make a powerful statement to unequivocally say the Britons embraced the new emperor based on the number of extant coins still found well into the modern period. This elevated the value of coinage in restoring parts of British history that would otherwise be lost to the mists of time and, by using evidence many of his learned peers already owned, it added justification and credibility to the discussion.

Stukeley constructed the chronology of the British Emperor almost exclusively from numismatics but this was because of his distrust for the Roman writers. His reasons
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for doing so were more concrete and distinct given Carausius’s questionable rise to power. Stukeley offered this analysis,

Tis much to be deplor’d, that in Diocletians’s bitter, and most violent persecution, all books…burnt. From this, we see, how the historys of that time must suffer, both civil and sacred: and among them the very historys of Diocletian, and of CARAUSIUS. Nothing could wholly escape that ravage, except the coins…

Add to this, that the roman writers would not readily care to do justice to the merit of CARAUSIUS, under the eye and cognizance of so malicious a person as Maximian; the lustre of whose character so much exceeded his…The consequence of all is this, that in the very meager scraps of his history time has spar’d us, sufficient tokens appear of partiality and misrepresentation.  

Stukeley’s sense of mistrust for Roman sources led to the necessity of other sources of information. In Carausius’s case, he was a usurper, nobler than his co-emperors, but who did not survive to write his story. So his situation begged the question, how is it possible to take the word of a writer who was chronicling an event antithetical to their patron’s experience? Maximian and Diocletian were forced to accept this renegade emperor for the seven years he ruled Britain and given that reality, it made sense to question contemporary and proceeding writings because a bias could conceivably be argued.

However, questioning these sources also allowed Stukeley to play up Carausius’s status as co-emperor, because instead of his reality as usurping emperor, it was Diocletian and Maximain’s bitterness that drove the lack of commentary. Instead of the possibility of a minimal impact created by Carausius, the lack of story became conspiratorial, which then required the use of tangible objects to truly set the record straight. It also helped that the majority of these tangible sources were only available in England, which emphasized the importance of the exploration of British sites. For example, when explaining why he chose to study Carausius he mentioned he wanted to “…restore to light, the evanescent
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traces of the history of this great man. my country bears no little part in those considerations here connected with Roman history, the worthiest, next to the sacred”

Essentially, it was only through Britain that the history of this Roman Emperor could be completely restored, a sentiment that was reiterated from the more direct preface, “the whole will be antiquitys of our own country: and those of no little account”

Britain held the key to understanding Carausius, correcting his story, and emphasizing the uniqueness of Britain.

Interestingly, Stukeley did not only utilize numismatics, which would have made sense for a work entitled the *Medallic History*. He also included an aside to the archaeological analysis that started him down his antiquarian path by scrutinizing the structures attributed to Carausius. Specifically, Stukeley wrote about two archaeological structures, Arthur’s Oon (Arthur’s Oven) in Scotland along the Carron River and the Carsdike, which allowed water-carriage from Cambridge to York. Both of these sites exhibited a specific value because of their uniquely Roman beginning and British end.

Arthur’s Oon, was particularly interesting because of its location. The rounded temple was located along the Carron River in Scotland, the northern-most defensible point the Romans reached. It was here they constructed the Antonine Wall from the Firth of Forth to the Irish Sea.

This wall, a series of earthen forts was occupied for only a few years before the Romans retreated back to the more defensible, and stronger, Hadrian’s Wall. This was significant because although the Romans maintained legions at the Antonine Wall until about 161 CE, they slowly pulled troops back before completely
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abandoning the wall in 162 CE\textsuperscript{205}, about 130 years before Carausius would wrest control of Britain from the Empire. This small, but noteworthy, detail held major implications for Stukeley’s telling of the story because the last Roman to even travel as far north as the Antonine Wall was Septimius Severus as he prepared for an invasion of Scotland that never materialized because of his death in 211 CE\textsuperscript{206}. His son, Caracalla, then abandoned the plan altogether in a rather muddy timeline around 212 CE, with no Roman moving near the Firth of Forth during the remainder of the Empire, at least until Carausius assumed control. However, this brief history was the reason for the significance of the location of Arthur’s Oon. According to Stukeley, this site was constructed to solidify and commemorate agreements reached between Carausius, the Picts, and the Scots\textsuperscript{207}, which would have had major ramifications because it would have reduced the threat of northern incursions. Arthur’s Oon was constructed in a territory the Romans had not been able to maintain in over a hundred years, yet Carausius in the span of a few years was able to create such a significant peace that he could construct a site well outside Roman control, a remarkable achievement.

This also illustrated his follow through on the articles of peace he had drawn up with Maximian and Diocletian, which included ensuring peace in his territories, and removed any justification the emperors had for removing him\textsuperscript{208}. Symbolically, this structure demonstrated the worth of British rule of Britain because no one else had maintained such a peace through the stretch of Roman occupation. Stukeley’s
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contemporaries would have been well aware of the implication of the assumed Carausius’s construction given the focus on Roman history in education\(^{209}\).

The temple itself was a relatively humble structure. According to Stukeley\(^{210}\), the stone was quarried from the countryside and assembled into a square base with a circular temple erected on top, in emulation of the Pantheon\(^{211}\). He mentioned the diameter, including both the Roman foot and its conversion into the English, with both being whole number measurements further tying the British ability to the exactness of the Roman. He then compared the elegant simplicity to the Pantheon again before Agrippa added his expensive “elegances”\(^{212}\). This tied the Britons to the original honesty of the Roman Empire; Carausius constructed a site reminiscent of the Romans before they added the excessive elements of their culture. This was a site of elaborate eagle motifs and images of victory that demonstrated the might of the Empire but also quietly illustrated the importance of the country that constructed it. Unfortunately, Stukeley’s archaeological descriptions were not as detailed as they were in his earlier books as the analysis was meant to serve his argument for the importance of the ruins. Carausius became an improver of the Roman province, he took a rebelling island and managed to quiet it and expand it beyond the bounds of even Rome. This control even included partial reconstruction of the Roman forts along the Antonine Wall to ensure the peace lasted\(^{213}\).

But Arthur’s Oon served another purpose; it had been destroyed for scrap material. When introducing the site, he mentioned he visited it early in his academic
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career and wrote on it in hopes of encouraging other academics to take part in preserving the ancient structures featured throughout Britain but like many sites of its kind, Arthur’s Oon faced an entirely man-made end,

But since then [the first, and only, time Stukeley had visited the site], to the extreme regret of lover of antiquity; to the dishonor of our country; the present Owner, out of a mean parsimony, pull’d down this noble structure, for the sake of the stones, to make a neighbouring mill-dam on the Carron river; in a country, where can be no want to such cheap materials.214

The fate of Arthur’s Oon was more offensive when looked at in the context of Stukeley’s motivations. If it is not possible to trust classical literature and very few written sources survive or even discuss integral aspects of English antiquity, the perpetrator of this destruction was erasing British history. This made research even more essential to create a narrative of the island before it disappeared completely. Carausius was an emperor that very few researched and if he had these major impacts on domestic and foreign relations, what else were the English scholars missing? Carausius was a call to focus on the home front and forgo the wasteful trips to the mainland. It told the story of a British emperor of significance who operated within the Roman Empire, someone who worked with instead of against while providing a more nuanced view of the relationship between the Romans and Britons than had originally been conceived when looking at figures like Boudicca and Caratacus.

Carausius for Stukeley was, above all, the perfect example of the British antiquity that deserved the attention of scholars. The story emphasized each piece of the argument he made throughout his career. And while the evidence for the history of Carausius, not the coinage but the story, was mostly constructed from the forged itinerary and document of Richard of Cirencester, it did not change the impact of a character like Carausius

214 Ibid, 130.
within the English narrative. Stukeley realized this impact when he wrote in his conclusion,

Thus have I, with brevity, endevor’d to bring order out of confusion, light from darkness; and shown, how by the help of these coins, we may draw out many outlines, of the life of our emperor, who was really an extraordinary great man: and by laying these lines together, we produce a plan of his history, where we have so little of it in authors…

As to that of Carausius, ‘tis an history highly interesting to Brittain; and at this time more eminently striking: when with our safety, as well as felicity, that of the empire of the sea is inseparably connected215.

The academic topics Stukeley explored in the *Medallic History* was driven by the story not by the evidence, he framed much of the material to fit the story and while that should discount the volume as a credible source of information, especially after the Richard of Cirencester manuscript was proven to be a fake, the impact the story has remained.

Carausius was the embodiment of the British importance Stukeley strove for and his passion for the subject would influence later nationalistic writers, antiquarians, and archaeological scholars on either side of Stukeley’s characterization.

**Conclusion**

The lack of historical attention paid to William Stukeley is disproportionate to the influence he had on later English antiquity and history. His use of scientifically based measurements and conclusions did not cease when he stopped publishing in 1763. Instead, scholars well after him employed, and improved, similar methods. The conversation about antiquaries among English scholars shifted heavily to native artifacts and sites with a focus on the physicality of the topic instead of the literary source. The Druids become a cultural phenomenon, eventually working their way through academia. In all this, scholars continued to cite Stukeley.
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William Stukeley provided a way to look at British antiquity before the Roman invasion, which allowed the British a chance to understand their origins, at least from the evidence, he does not seem to have done this out of a sense of what we would identify as nationalism. Instead, this intellectual pointed out a problem he acknowledged about the current state of the upper-middle and upper class of England so patriotism is a more apt description of at least some of his motivation. That being said, the care he took to examine individual sites and record not only usable data but also posit ideas of the original creators influenced the nationalist movement that would build toward the end of his life. Stukeley’s impact was two fold: he provided the first glimpses of the discipline that would become archaeology and he gave Britain a history that was much more complex and nuanced than the chronicles and histories of Camden, Leland, and Milton. This provided the basis for academic patriotism lacking in the cosmopolitan world, and convinced at least some English to study England.

While Stukeley’s ideas would ultimately break down into the fantastic as he aged, his initial works, and the works he was remembered for, would have an impact on the intellectuals throughout the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The ability to understand their country’s origins had massive implications for British nationalism as Britain entered into a new, and evolving, chapter of its empire. Stukeley’s use of mathematics and accurate measurements had implications for the mostly text-based field of antiquarianism because now evidence was less cut and dried, and it became necessary to take into account the bias and agenda of the classical authors before comparing that to the extant archaeological evidence. These revolutionary methods of research lead to the questions in the last chapter, how were Stukeley’s ideas translated into both the discipline
of antiquarianism and how did his conclusions feed into the sense of growing nationalism that emerged in the 1740s?
Stukeley’s rediscovery of English origins, in both factual and incorrect forms, inspired those scholars who would take up the mantle after his death, including a growth of interest in the story of Carausius and the re-imagination of Stonehenge. His analysis of sites, use of tangible elements reinforced by text, and focus on Britain alone influenced the next generation of historians, archaeologists, and artists helping to bolster the nationalist movement in Britain. Of course, Stukeley did not single-handedly lay the roots for a nationalist movement but he did greatly influence those who would refine the movement. Whether scholars argued against his conclusions, a challenge easily accepted with a cursory look at some of his more grandiose theories, or celebrated the contributions he had made to the field, much like Gough in his expanded history of Carausius, Stukeley was discussed and there was inarguable evidence that he had a significant impact on the way the British saw their history and themselves.

Carausius is an appropriate place to start. Starting in the late 1700s, references to Carausian coins began to pop up in numismatic societies alongside articles about Roman coins found in Pompeii and Exeter, which led an academic who signed his name simply
as A. to write, “The numerous coins struck by Carausius and his successor in Britain, deserve more attention than has hitherto been bestowed on them”\(^2\). But it was not just numismatists who gravitated toward the idea of Carausius, even as early as 1792, his story was further integrated into British scholarship when Richard Gough tackled the subject in *The History of Carausius or, an Examination Of what has been advanced on that Subject by Genebrier and Stukeley in which The many Errors and Inaccuracies of both Writers are pointed out and corrected*. While quite a mouthful and a seemingly negative review of the work done by Stukeley, Gouge was significantly less scathing within the text, where he emphasized the importance of bringing this leader out of obscurity and praising the first person to effectively do so for the English. In the opening lines of his work, Gough stated,

> It is impossible to peruse the *medallic History of M. A. V. Carausius* without congratulating the Age which produc’d its Author, whose happy inventive Faculty has already rescued so many important Monuments from the darkest Obscurity, and restored so many forgotten great Personages to their Country. The Health of his Countrymen having been the Object of his earlier Thoughts, he is dedicating to their Improvement in Learning and Knowledge those of his later Monuments…Free from the selfish Views of too many Antiquarians, his sole Aim is to ennoble his Country by tracing its earliest History, and proposing to public Imitation the great Examples of its Saints and Heroes\(^3\).

Gouge highlighted the motive behind Stukeley’s research as well as acknowledged its impact on the study of English antiquity. Stukeley addressed issues with the preservation of British sites, a theme he maintained throughout his academic career but with comments like those by Gough, it was apparent that later antiquarians gave him credit for that as well.
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But Gough and others have since gone a step farther, crediting Stukeley with reintroducing Carausius into the British chronology, elevating the study of antiquities, and providing the British with a hero who was both Roman and British, a necessary character for nationalism. Carausius became a British hero who adapted to the Roman world and emphasized the inherent right of the British to the Roman title. In addition, Gough’s book demonstrated the impact Stukeley’s pleas had within academia because throughout there was an undercurrent of distrust of the ancient authors with a push for hard evidence native to the British Isles as a replacement for the lacking written sources. Carausius became the poster individual for the bias of Roman sources, where he was mentioned as an afterthought, another in a long line of possible usurpers. Characteristics of Carausius also carried over from Stukeley’s flawed Medallic History, as Gough maintained the underlying story of betrayal and misrepresentation. And while Gough corrected much of the historical transcript such as including Carausius’s alleged skimming from the Treasury, the emperor’s skill, betrayal, and title of co-emperor did not change, which solidified this Carausius character and became the running narrative, one that still lasts today.

As historiography on Roman Britain has grown, the character of Carausius has changed, and while he remained a minor character Carausius has not disappeared. The emperor still maintains a presence in British academic and popular history, in many instances retaining his heroic position, a point P.J. Casey made when talking about his personification throughout the modern historiography,

Scholarly attitudes towards the protagonists vary little from those expressed by Stukeley in his account of this period. The tendency has been to see Carausius as a heroic figure, whilst Allectus has been relegated to the position of villain of the
tale, whose function was to put an end to the life of the bluff sailor hero and then to wait supinely to be extinguished by another heroic figure, Constantius\textsuperscript{218}

That maintenance of heroism is partially because of the importance of Carausius to British nationalism and history. One individual Casey specifically pointed to was Edward Gibbon, of \textit{The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire} fame, a British historian who was counted among nationalist writers\textsuperscript{219}. When writing about Carausius Gibbon mentioned, “Dr. Stukely, in particular, has devoted a large volume to the British emperor. I have used his materials, and rejected most of his fanciful conjectures”\textsuperscript{220}. Gibbon wanted to move away from the overt victimhood of Stukeley but still he could not quite lay blame or fault at Carausius’s feet. When writing about the syphoning of funds that ultimately got Carausius into trouble, Gibbon deflected some of the blame, “The wealth of Carausius was, on this occasion, very justly considered as evidence of his guilt; and Maximian had already given orders for his death”\textsuperscript{221}. So even though Carausius probably did take the plunder, Maximian had already given the order for his death, for an undisclosed reason, which could have been the injured pride Stukeley alluded to without Gibbon explicitly stating it.

Also the idea of the worth of the island of Britain was maintained in Gibbon’s work when the eminent author pointed out the lament of the Romans when they realized Britain had been severed from the greater Empire and they lost access to the goods, land, and most important, revenue of the people there\textsuperscript{222}. This was then compounded by the fact that Carausius used the island’s wealth to “defend[…] the frontiers of his dominions
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against the Caledonians of the North, invited, from the continent, a great number of skillful artists, and displayed, on a variety of coins that are still extant, his taste and opulence”\textsuperscript{223}. The manner in which Gibbon characterized Carausius was far closer to the character Stukeley had described than it was different. The usurper was still the confident and skilled commander who outsmarted the Romans and provided a taste of freedom to the ancient Britons. Although Gibbon did correct Stukeley’s placement of his birth in Wales, instead citing Carausius’s birthplace as Gaul, he maintained Stukeley’s emphasis on sea power. Gibbon wrote, “Under his command, Britain, destined in a future age to obtain the empire of the sea, already assumed its natural and respectable station of a maritime power”\textsuperscript{224}. Carausius was again the embodiment of the naval might of Britain, so while Gibbon corrected many of the factual errors of the \textit{Medallic History}, the character of Carausius did not change and he maintained the status of wronged emperor of Britain, destined to prove the might of the island in his short reign. This continued character of Carausius kept Stukeley’s relevance alive as well as demonstrating the impact his “activities”\textsuperscript{225} had on nationalist rhetoric.

However, past historiography is not the only place this characterization is found; non-scholarly attitudes and popular culture maintain this persona for Carausius. A poignant example was the Brexit controversy in June 2016, when Public Radio International published an article entitled, “Britain’s first ‘Brexit’: 286 A.D. It didn’t last long” where the author Christopher Woolf drew comparisons between Britain’s 2016 vote to exit the European Union and Carausius’s rebellion against the Roman Empire,
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with culturally apropos comparisons to Game of Thrones. While ignoring the ridiculous claims that Carausius harnessed “latent Celtic nationalism”, Woolf pointed out the ability of Carausius to unite dissatisfied portions of the northern part of the empire, a trend that is difficult to refute given extant sources. However, Woolf played up the “nationalistic” effort of Carausius to create a unified Britain to stand against the Roman Empire, a goal that is significantly overplayed if one looks at the numerous coins that emphasize the “brotherhood” of Roman emperors Carausius pushed during his reign. Still, Woolf’s characterization was not a stretch given the way Stukeley and later historians wrote about Carausius. In this short article, Woolf championed Carausius as a nationalist with close ties to the Celtic populations on either side of the Channel, who “established an effective government, rais[ed] taxes and issu[ed] coins, [built] roads, milestones, and forts. He won the support of the middle class. He sought peace with his ‘brothers’ – the emperors of Rome, but failed. Ultimately, this article accentuated the nationalism imbibed in Carausius’s legacy since his reintroduction to English history by Stukeley. This is evidence of the influence Stukeley had on early idea of nationalism, by bringing to light the characters and creations that would inform later nationalistic movements, Stukeley filled the role of the artist/intellectual put forward by Newman. And Woolf was not the only writer to make this connection, TheConversation, USA Today, the Financial Times and multiple other news outlets looked to Carausius as a
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historical demonstration of Britain’s willingness to rebel in the hopes of explaining the shocking result of the Brexit vote.

Unfortunately, there is no historical evidence of the nationalism of Carausius, only that he seized the British territories to escape a claim of embezzling money from his naval captures but given his insistence that he was a “brother” emperor, that he was a Roman, and his continual coining of Romanesque coins and construction of Romanized buildings, nationalism was a fanciful exaggeration with no concrete evidence. However, the legacy of this character has its roots in the *Medallic History*, with the first major introduction of this character to British chronology.

Carausius was a microcosm of many of the arguments of Stukeley. The British usurper demonstrated the inherent power of Britain while requiring numismatics to prove his existance and archaeological analysis to reinforce the argument but that led directly back into the ideas of preservation and archaeology, a major push for Stukeley. Interest in preservation was a goal he achieved but in a slightly different way than the shame he started with, because in using the analytical, pseudo-archaeological, methods he did; he forced others to use similar methods. This benefitted sites because it required continued analysis of physical locations and artifacts, which led to nuanced, scientific discussions about the reality of the site. Simply put, it made tangible research necessary.

For the necessity of tangible research needed, one does not need to look beyond the writings of the Society of Antiquaries. In a letter from Smart Lethieullier, *Esq. to Mr. Gale; concerning the old Roman Roads*, Lethieullier contended that Stukeley misdirected the course of Icening-street, one of the extant Roman roads on a path where Lethieullier argued, “I have examined a great part of the intermediate country myself, and likewise
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enquired of many sensible persons perfectly acquainted with it; and could never see or hear of any bank or causeway, in the least resembling a Roman road, which went between them…”\(^{232}\). When Lethieullier followed the path Stukeley claimed, he ended up in Sir Philip Meadow’s gardens at Lurgishall, a territory Stukeley’s recreation never travelled through. Stukeley had reached the wrong location but because of the nature of the evidence, it forced Lethieullier to visit the area to prove this inaccuracy and provide a convincing counterargument. The rest of this letter was a landscape survey of the area around this contentious road where Lethieullier demonstrated Stukeley’s mistakes through careful measurement and personal exploration\(^{233}\). All this read similarly to the methods Stukeley advocated in his own tours of England. And Lethieullier’s paper was not unique in its criticisms. A letter from Browne Willis Esq urged “the gentlemen of the Society, and Dr. Stukely in particular”\(^{234}\) to observe a treatise written by a Mr. Taylor. Taylor surveyed the area around Hampshire and discovered a discrepancy between his findings and Stukeley’s description of the area in his *Itinerarium Curiosum*\(^ {235}\). Much like Lethieullier, Taylor used landscape observation and recorded measurements to disprove Stukeley’s analysis and at the same time furthered the conversation Stukeley started.

Stukeley’s conclusions were not only disproved, they were accepted and nuanced. In his submission to the Society of Antiquaries, “*Observations upon Shrines*”, John Loveday built on Stukeley’s distinctions of ancient shrines. Loveday believed Stukeley “accurately distinguished two kinds of shrines, both equally made for receiving the

\(^{232}\) Society of Antiquaries of London. *Archaeologia Or, Miscellaneous Tracts Relating to Antiquity. Published by the Society of Antiquaries of London. Volume IV*. Vol. 1. (London: Printed by J. Nichols, Printer to the Society; and Sold at Their Apartments in Somerset Place; and by Messieurs White, Robson, Leigh and Sotheby, and Brown, 1770), 56.
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reliques of saints”236, only to go on a say that he was not distinct enough in his descriptions. To prove this point, Loveday offered his new distinctions for fixed shrines – those meant to hold pieces of saints and those that were not – and used observations within five well-known churches to support his thesis237. Loveday traveled to each site, gathering enough physical evidence to support his further breakdown of Stukeley’s existing conclusions. Loveday’s article illustrated the growing reliance on physical evidence necessary to prove an argument. The basis for Loveday’s thesis also meant Stukeley continued as a source of information after his death.

Not all who referenced Stukeley were doing so to contradict or nuance his findings, some were simply trying to prove him correct. Thomas Percival in 1760 “traced the Roman roads from Manchester with the utmost care” and found that “…the VIth Iter of Richard the Monk, published by Dr. Stukely; the whole Iter is exact and the places well ascertained”238. Much like the above criticisms, Percival’s conclusion was only valid after he had taken the time to trace these sites himself. Although not as well documented as Lethieullier and Taylor, Percival’s journey illustrated the importance of the physical reality. There was no evidence that Percival simply read Stukeley’s work and agreed because he made the point that he took the time to see the areas before reaching a conclusion239. Percival’s journey mimicked the *Itinerarium Curiosum* published about forty years previous. But the legacy of Stukeley was not just found in the landscape.
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In 1756, John Booth wrote a detailed physical analysis to Joseph Ames after Arabic and Roman numerals were discovered carved into a stone under the foundations of the Black Swan Inn\(^{240}\). According to Booth, this artifact demonstrated Moorish characteristics were present in England earlier than the conclusions made by contemporary antiquarians suggested. But the piece of stone was not the only evidence for his argument. Booth used the age of the site, giving the credit to Stukeley,

> Another reason may be drawn from the form of the building…which, for grandeur, loftiness and appearance, almost exceed any other antient building within the bills of mortality; which induced the learned Dr. Stukeley to be of opinion (before this stone was discovered) that it was built as early as the Conquest…And the finding this stone in a great measure confirms Dr. Stukely’s conjecture, and carried the antiquity of Moorish characteristics…more than 100 years earlier than either Dr. Wallis, or the learned Dr. Ward of Graham college, have fixed them…"\(^{241}\).

Stukeley was toward the end of his writing career and had left the Society of Antiquarians but his finding still influenced those scholars still involved. Booth included scale drawings of the discovery area as well as the ancient building and the current inn. Booth referenced Stukeley but relied on physical remains to illustrate his point, using classical writers as for his findings. Booth stressed it was the physical remains that made the conclusion credible, an allusion to his predecessor. Scholars like Booth, Lethiellier, and Taylor demonstrated the conclusions and methods of Stukeley had filtered through the Society of Antiquarians. His methods would become pervasive, influencing even those who never directly cited him.

The journal published by the Society of Antiquities, the *Archaeologia*, bared many of these influences. Reliance on observable facets of the site, landscape surveys, and detailed measurements cover the pages and many articles included some correction
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of the work of older scholars. In 1766, John Watson, an antiquarian thirty-eight years Stukeley’s junior, published, “A Mistaken Passage in Bede’s Ecclesiastical History Explained”. This article explored a mistaken translation in Bede’s history. Watson argued that the site of Castle Hill near Almonbury was not the Roman site of Cambodunum but was in fact the site of Danum, which was later resettled by the Saxons. Watson relied on the lack of physical evidence – no Roman coins, altars, or relics were found near the site – as well as the effects of sites like this on the landscape, providing a multistep phasing of the site from a temporary Roman site to a Saxon stronghold. Watson compared the Castle Hill site to locations conclusively proven to be Roman to demonstrate the abnormality of Castle Hill existing as a well-used Roman camp he stated, “It was not common for the Romans to have their stations on so high a piece of ground as this, except in cases of danger or distress”\textsuperscript{242}. Since this was traditionally the case, Watson then argued the Romans built this site but quickly vacated it once the threat passed. That left the position available to the Saxons, who later fortified the once temporary site\textsuperscript{243}. According to Watson, this course of events explained why no Roman artifacts were found and was supported by the fact that the Saxons did, “frequently settle within those walls which the Romans had constructed”\textsuperscript{244}. To support this physical evidence, Watson then went back into the literature to find the origin of the mistake, discovering it in a translation from King Alfred\textsuperscript{245}. This level of nuanced analysis echoed Stukeley’s work on Stonehenge and, given the number of times other authors referenced
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Stukeley and his standing as a founder of the Society of Antiquaries, it was unlikely that the younger Watson had never been exposed to his method of scholarship.

Watson was not the only junior of Stukeley who wrote with this level of nuance. John Strange, forty-five years Stukeley’s junior, published “Account of some Remains of Roman and other Antiquities, in and near the City of Brecknock, in South Wales”. In this article Strange argued there had been a higher incidence of Roman influence in Wales than previously published. His inquiry was based on the lack of exploration of the area, “But as the former [Leland] only proposed an Itinerary through the country; as it does not appear that Camden visited every part himself; and as Lhwyd sometimes depended on the relations of others; sufficient scope yet remains for the researches of the inquisitive”\textsuperscript{246}. Strange advocated the visitation of the site to sufficiently satisfy the curiosity of scholars. So, following his own advice, he found a multitude of Roman items including coins, bricks, monuments, and camps constructed in the Roman style, which supported his argument that the Romans had, in some capacity, been present in Wales. In addition, he solved an issue with the lack of Roman roads into and out of the area. Strange discovered a causeway that branched off the “great” Roman causeway that ran from Caerleon to the vale of Usk\textsuperscript{247}. This causeway would have allowed access to the site. Strange also found archaeological evidence, within the center of the causeway, a statue was uncovered and on closer inspection, a Latin inscription was found at the base of the statue that used
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coniunx, the Latin word for wife. From here, Strange detailed the landscape of the site, providing dimensions and measurements that he attributed to the Romans.

Strange and Watson were two examples of an expanding reliance on presence, physical locations and artifacts as evidence, a pattern that fit with the evolution of *Archaeologia*. The journal published throughout the years had an increasing number of scale drawings and scientific research. While the entirety of this cannot be attributed to Stukeley, it is possible to say that since he was the first one to widely advocate research and conclusions using these methods in Britain, he had a significant influence on this trend. This reality was directly illustrated by the shift in the discussion of Stonehenge.

Before Stukeley wrote about the site of Stonehenge, previous scholars had done little work with the site itself. As mentioned above, William Camden offered forty lines of analysis of the site and Jones attributed it to the Romans. The scholar who came the closest to the level of nuance Stukeley achieved, was John Aubrey but even in his published work, *Monumenta Britannica*, he never used precise measurements, the closest he came was his reliance on measurements done in paces across the site. There was no understanding of the size of the stones or accurate distances between each stone and Aubrey’s recreations were unsupported by the locations of extant stones. While Aubrey did include multiple figures and drawings of the site, none were drawn to scale. This same deficiency was seen in Inigo Jones’s and William Camden’s descriptions of Stonehenge. Stukeley was the first one to take detailed measurements.
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After Stukeley’s work was published and widely known, lack of interest was not the case. William Cunnington, a renowned barrow digger and geologist published extensively on the British barrows and Stonehenge. In his article “Sarsens”, he weighed the sarsen sandstone pieces at 154 lbs, the first time the stones had been weighed, leading to his conclusion from a later work that, “Constructive ability was shown not alone in the transport and setting up of these huge stones, but in the system of mortise and tenon and dovetailing employed to secure the transverse slabs” 251. Flinders Petrie joined this same tradition when he wrote about Stonehenge from 1874-1877. His treatise, Stonehenge: Plans, Description, and Theories read similar to Stukeley’s unpublished work on Stonehenge, except he relied on more detailed measurements, down to the 100th of an inch at some points 252. Petrie listed measurements of the stones, detailed descriptions of the tools used, and even the general depth of pockmarks on individual stones. Petrie was extremely thorough and deserved his title of the “Father of Archaeology” but he was a product of his training. Stukeley was the only earlier scholar writing in a style similar to what Petrie would use. In addition to the similarities in discovery, Petrie also mentioned the work Stukeley did, referring the reader to his work for the history of the monument in comparison to the other authors mentioned through this thesis, such as Webb and Hoare 253. Stukeley’s descriptions and scientific approach to antiquities led to a shift in the discussion of historic (or pre-historic) sites, as demonstrated by the increased use of, what was increasingly recognized as, archaeology to prove conclusions. Petrie would
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take these skills and use them to great acclaim in Egypt but he first learned them in the world of English scholarship enabled by Stukeley.

Stonehenge and archaeology were not the only specific aspects of British antiquity that benefitted from Stukeley’s interest; one of his main beneficiaries was the mystical figure of the Druid. The Druid was not a new phenomenon in Britain, J. M. S. Thompson pointed out that the Druid started to appear as a literary device at the beginning of the seventeenth century after being dredged up by Renaissance scholars from the classical works of Greece and Rome\textsuperscript{254}; however, in the works cited in *In Yonder Grave A Druid Lies*, by J.M.S. Thompson, *Bonduca* by John Fletcher, *Polyolbion* by Michael Drayton, and Milton’s ‘Lycidas’, the druids did not operate outside the mystical, otherworldly realm to which Caesar’s vague description relegated them. In “The Complete Works of Michael Drayton”, Reverend Richard Hooper summed up the way the druids were used by all three of Thompson’s exhibited authors, “Understand the knowledge of those great Philosophers, Priests, and Lawyers called Druids. Their discipline was first found out in this Isle, and afterward transferred into Gaul; whence their youth were sent hither as to an University for instruction in their learned professions…”\textsuperscript{255}. In each of these works, the Druids were tertiary characters who operated as prophets, bards, and teachers in equal measure as a way to move the plot forward but no mentioned situations pulled them out of the timeless realm they occupied. This in turn helped to fuel the fantastic idea they were the mythical advisors of King Arthur, and caused the historical reality to flit within the jumbled timeline that was British history.
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In early modern literature, druids were an intriguing and mysterious plot device in the fantasy genres but that only entrenched them farther into the realm of fiction. Initially Stukeley’s introduction of the Druids as an explanation for a structure proven older than the Romans lent an air of historical authenticity to the mysterious individuals. Unfortunately, his later works probably did more to hurt the understanding of druidic culture, as the creativeness of his later years overtook his earlier investigative analysis but his standing as a scholar created a way to introduce the Druids to scholars who wanted to contradict, or use, Stukeley’s conclusions. Toward the end of his career, Stukeley became obsessed with the Druidic legacy he saw in England. He wrote extensively and created a history of the Druids that not only tied them to proto-Christianity but also made them descendants of Abraham brought to England by Hercules\textsuperscript{256}. This is an unreasonable conclusion and we know today that the timeline, let alone any factual source, cannot support this. However, utilizing today’s knowledge does not negate the effect this conclusion had on contemporary British scholarship and writing. The Druids became an integral part of English literature because of their utilization by writers and scholars after their popularization by Stukeley. Stuart Piggott detailed this effect when he stated, “The indebtedness of Gray, Collins, Mason, and other poets to Stukeley’s ideas on Druids has long been recognized, but the debt owed by William Blake to the Stonehenge and Avebury volumes is only beginning to be recognized”\textsuperscript{257}. When Stukeley wrote \textit{Stonehenge A Temple Restor’d to the British Druids}, he irrevocably tied Stonehenge to the Druids since he was the first to offer what seemed like legitimate archaeological proof that the Druids had been the builders.

\textsuperscript{256} William Stukeley, \textit{Palæographia Sacra; Or, Discourses on Sacred Subjects} (London: Printed by Richard Hett and Sold by J. Baillie, 1763).
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Stukeley’s Druids became the ancient Britons, founders of culture in England, driving the Romans out of this role and giving England an origin beyond the continent. Throughout his later career, Stukeley romanticized the Druids eventually allowing “Edward Williams…[to] write naturally of ‘The Patriarchial Religion of Ancient Britain, called Druidism’, while another Welshman, Edward Davies, in his *Celtic Researches* (1804), takes it as a matter of course that the Druids had inherited a religious tradition from Adam and Noah”\(^{258}\). While this obsession with the Druids was the reason many scholars write off Stukeley today, at the time it made the Druids a symbol of Britain, the founders of a culture uniquely British. And it was almost exclusively because of Stukeley’s early inexhaustible research into their culture.

Stukeley’s Druids became the holders of proto-Christian religion, which not only tied Britain to the “true” religion but also made it an appealing thesis for writers. However, this connection existed outside the artistic British minds, it worked its way into scholarship. A publication entitled *A Description of Stonehenge, Abiry, &c. in Wiltshire. With An Account of the Learning and Discipline of the Druids. To Which is Added, An Account of Antiquities on Salisbury Plain*, was published in 1788. Unfortunately, the author is unknown but the connections between the Druids and Christianity are obvious. The author took the time to cite Stukeley’s conclusions on the Druidic use of the Stonehenge altars for libations and sacrifices, their origin from the Tyrian Hercules, and their connection to Melchisedec, which Stukeley referred to as “a delineation of the first patriarchal religion”\(^{259}\), multiple times in an effort to support his point\(^{260}\). These are
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pulled directly from Stukeley’s 1740 publication. In addition to this direct connection to
Stukeley, the author backed the connection of the Druids to the Phoenicians, when he
pointed out that the Phoenicians considered the sun holy and so constructed circular
temples modeled after this shape\textsuperscript{261}. Stukeley’s ideas showed up twenty different times
throughout this treatise as support for this author’s continued exploration into the Druidic
origin of the sites of Wiltshire.

However, the unnamed author was not a singular example. In 1794, a member of
the Society of Antiquaries, Hayman Rooke Esq., submitted a letter entitled, \textit{An Account
of some Druidical Remains in Derbyshire}. Within this letter he described some “hitherto
unnoticed” remains which he attributes to the Druids because the monuments were of
“remote antiquity…and undoubtedly the most ancient we have in Britain are those of the
Druids, whose religion was, most probably, that of the Patriarch Abraham, brought into
this island by a Phoenician colony soon after his time. Dr. Stukeley was of this
opinion…”\textsuperscript{262}. The druids fast became the explanation for any ancient monument that
was clearly not from a post-Roman period and that lead to a druidic hold on ancient
monuments. In the case of Rooke, he wrote about “rocking stones, rock idols, and other
singularly shaped rocks” that could only have been constructed by skilled artisans which
landed squarely in the laps of the druids since, “we are assured that the Druids were well
skilled in the art of magic, by which the superstitious Britons were led implicitly to
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believe in the miracles performed by these rocking stones. The Druids created these rock anomalies because tool marks are visible, especially on the stone basins that Rooke brings up later, but also because there was no way the ancient Britons would have been able to create any structures like this with their limited knowledge, it would instead fall to their possessors of knowledge, the Druids, to instruct them.

Rooke analyzed the size and shape of any structure artificially created. These were tendencies that Stukeley favored and promoted throughout his works. In addition, Rooke ensured at least one of these sites was preserved when he stated, “…looking down upon Overton hall, an estate of Sir Joseph Banks, Bart. the respectable President of the Royal Society, who will undoubtedly preserve this curious Druidical monument.” The issue of the destruction of sites like Arthur’s Oon or Avebury is brought to mind with a comment like this, as preservation of ancient sites in Britain were being seriously considered as the scholarship continued forward. Ultimately, Rooke represented a trend, Stukeley died in 1765 but almost thirty years later, his work was still utilized because his conclusions on the Druids gave England an origin older than the Romans and by tying it to the “true” religion; it meant that Anglican Christianity was a direct descendent of Abraham. This lent desire for correctness to Stukeley’s conclusions and that made them powerful and influential. This was also a contributor to the continued connection of Stonehenge and other henges to the Druids while also showing the influence Stukeley had on the development of the understanding of English antiquity well after his death.

The increasing fiction of Stukeley’s conclusions the longer he wrote has led to the majority of the negative attention he received beyond his lifetime. But even those who
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are rightly critical of his conclusions about the Druids, like Kendrick, begrudgingly point to the success of his ideas, “it is enough that he was in earnest and that he was successful in the propagation of the doctrine; more suddenly and completely successful than any other archaeological teacher I can call to mind”\textsuperscript{265}. Ultimately, the effort of Stukeley to reintroduce the Druids into the history of Britain succeeded in the increased talk about the culture in the academic community and in the country as a whole. The Druids showed up in \textit{The Dublin Penny Journal} and \textit{The Cambro-Briton} and while there is no extant proof this was directly a result of Stukeley’s efforts, the timing is telling of a wider phenomenon that he was at least on the cusp of. The preface written by the \textit{Cambro-Briton}’s editor, Reverend Evan Evans demonstrated the shifts that were taking place in not only the academic community but also the educated British world as a whole,

It is more than probable, that many of these pithy sentences and proverbial sayings, these aphorisms of wisdom and axioms of prudence, were the productions of the venerable Druids; and they exhibit, in the present imperfect form, in which they have been delivered to us, no despicable specimen of those verses mentioned by Caesar, in the seemingly enigmatical mysteries of which their pupils were initiated, and spent many years in acquiring and committing them to memory.”\textsuperscript{266}

Within this statement alone, the ghosts of Stukeley’s arguments were evident. There is a blatant distrust of the works of Caesar; the proverbs that Evans noted are the “imperfect form” because of their transmission through the Roman conquerors. In addition, the Druids were venerable, no longer were they part of the uncivilized British who needed civilized by the Romans, as Milton postulated. There was a pride in the work of the Druids in this short preface in a periodical that was intended to publish articles on the

history and antiquity of Cambria. The periodical itself often contained articles that included the Druids in some capacity but the interest in evidence was present as well, with many authors citing other works in the way academics did.

The growth of the popularity of the Druids did not end in the 18th or 19th centuries. Since then the interest has only grown in both popular culture and in the academic world. There is still an element of mysticism within this interest but the perceived connections the Druids have with Stonehenge and Britain has not changed since Stukeley’s insistent connections. The ceremony cited at the beginning of this paper was an example of the maintenance of this connection. For better or worse, William Stukeley thrust the idea of the Druids into both the academic and popular community in the eighteenth century with the first sustained study of the monuments in Britain. The embrace of the Druids, like the interest in Carausius, helped to lead to the final influence of Stukeley on nationalism, a growing trend in Britain by the mid-eighteenth century and one that was bolstered by the newly emphasized pre-Roman history of Britain, which was proven through the study of archaeology.

Of all of his influences, nationalism is the most nebulous because Stukeley was not considered a nationalist writer, nor was he still publishing at the beginning of the nationalism movement in Britain but his focus during his career gave British scholars, and nationalists, an insight into their antiquity. The study of British antiquities by the antiquarians became a trend that was growing after the pushes for the study of homegrown history by Stukeley and similar scholars, like Thomas Carte who wrote *A General History of England* in 1747. In addition, because many of the pre-Roman
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cultures could only be understood with archaeology, there was a major shift in the type of materials used to explain the new findings. As mentioned above, archaeological study became increasingly important as the scholarly value of it was noticed, especially for nationalism. In Barbara and Thomas Lynch’s book *The beginnings of a scientific approach to prehistoric archaeology in 17th and 18th century Britain*, they addressed this change, “By 1750, a number of antiquarians not only considered pre-Roman relics to be of great importance; they also distinguished between the problems of historic archaeology and the archaeology of remains which antedated written sources (Stukeley 1724: 2, Wise 1742:3)“268. There was a growing spark within the antiquarian community that looked to the archaeological remains of Britain to explain past cultures in a way that bypassed the literary sources.

The connection between archaeology and nationalism is not new one; numerous historians have explored it because of its integral connection to understanding the unwritten, prehistoric history of a people. In his article “Nationalism and Archaeology: On the Constructions of Nations and the Reconstructions of the Remote Past”, Philip Kohl made the point, “The association between the development of archaeology and nation-building was so obvious as to remain largely unquestioned throughout the nineteenth century and most of the twentieth century; the roots of countries were extended back into the mists of the prehistoric past“269. Archaeology offered the key to exploring a world that could not be teased out of text and shed light on a past that would
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otherwise remain shrouded in mystery and fiction, providing an outlet for the English specifically. H. A. L. Fisher defined the issue in his three volume series, *A History of Europe*,

The Norman Conquest had made of England a province of French civilization. The language of the aristocracy, of the government, of the law courts, was French. It was from the Ile de France that England derived its Gothic architecture...The university movement, so far at least as England was concerned, originated in Paris.²⁷⁰

There seemed to have been an understood prestige to French society and the British were well aware of the effects of not only the Norman Conquest but the influence of French culture on the educated class, which left France with a leg up on the English. While the Romans conquered both of the groups, only the Normans, based in France, managed to conquer England, something that early British antiquarians did not forget. Stukeley, by offering an analytical framework to study pre-history, found a way to provide Britain with a civilized history they could point to that was not defined by conquest.

English antiquity became a way to study the uniqueness of British heritage, of telling a story that did not require another power to enforce civilization. This made the value of monuments and extant antiquity invaluable. David Harvey explained how the phenomenon of the history of ancient monuments influenced the national character in Britain from 1675-1850,

Ancient monuments, therefore, result from the decisions of people in the present, about what memories they wish to ascribe on to the future and appear to be at the forefront of such cultural production; potent memory factories, whose output consists of mediated memories that herald what is to come²⁷¹

Ancient monuments were more than just the stones that created them, they were a way to tell the story of Britain from the perspective of ancient Britons and while much of the story was just that, the interpretation was important. Stukeley provided an interpretation that freed Britain from the civilizing influence of both Rome and France because it showed the Druids, people held in high accord by the Gauls (or French) as told by Caesar, were actually British and constructed these monuments that none of the intervening conquerors could understand. That was a powerful story that offered a specific future to the reader: Britain used to be dominant and by embracing British antiquity, could be again. While Stukeley was not a nationalist, he did have undertones of nationalism in his works that would be used by later nationalist writers.

E. Ledwich was one such writer. Writing in the late eighteenth century, he looked at the antiquities of Ireland but explained the importance of monuments in a way that explained the British interest as well, “National antiquities have always engendered the attention of every learned and polished people…Questions involving national honor naturally raise the flame of patriotism in every breast, and produce contests between kingdoms concerning their antiquities.” While Ledwich was addressing the differences between the British and Irish kingdoms, the sentiment rang true for British and French relations as well. Ledwich implied the pride that can be found in studying national monuments to prove the superiority of one’s own kingdom. This was a sentiment echoed by the British antiquarian, Henry Browne in *An Illustration of Stonehenge and Abury*, “…they [ancient sites] gave ascendancy in importance to this, our
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country, over all others”\textsuperscript{274}. The ancient sites were unique and the ability to prove, even with fantasized material, that the countries were unique and older than other civilizations, specifically conquerors, allowed for a history untainted by their usurping cultures. Stukeley provided the framework that others utilized to prove the importance of the sites and he promoted a British national consciousness through his work, a consciousness that was still nascent during his later years, but one that was nonetheless growing.

Antiquarians were not immune to this national consciousness. Henry Browne was mentioned above and his treatise followed a similar line to Stukeley’s. Browne agreed that Stonehenge was much older than the Roman conquest and stated, “…[Stonehenge] be found to be antecedent to this conquest and knowledge, reference to Roman literature will be nothing better than a waste of time, and lead us astray from the object which we seek to attain”\textsuperscript{275}. The venom that was sometimes present in Stukeley’s work was gone but the distrust of non-British sources remained, the Greeks did not escape criticism either because although they were world renowned writers, according to Browne they “are no better than pirates…” when it comes to the British situation\textsuperscript{276}. From here Browne commented, “And is this little spot, an island, the least I may almost say of countries, destined before all others to this great, this mighty, this most glorious of ends!”\textsuperscript{277}. Once he finished with the celebration of Britain, Browne started into the story of Stonehenge but before revealing any of its history he ensured the reader has a detailed understanding of the dimensions and extant remains of the structure, with accurate
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measurements and references between stones\textsuperscript{278}. Browne then laid out the builders of Stonehenge. In his conclusion, Browne maintained the Phoenicians, not the Druids, built Stonehenge before Noah’s Flood, the timing matched with the ideas Stukeley had laid out even if the builders did not\textsuperscript{279}. Without repeating the entirety of this volume, the importance of this cursory glance was the interest in the site and the growing sentiment and British exceptionalism in the preface. Written as a tourist guide for the site that Browne’s son, John, curated, this book also emphasized in the understanding necessary to preserve the stones and ensure all to could witness them.

Richard Colt Hoare was another antiquarian to operate in this vain; Hoare was the first to do a detailed study of the county of Wiltshire, the county that contains Stonehenge and Avebury. Hoare wrote, “It is somewhat singular that so interesting a County as Wiltshire should have hitherto remained but partially described; for, if we except the works of the learned Stukeley, on our British remains at Abury and Stonehenge…little of importance has been published illustrative of a County which stands unrivalled in its British relics…”\textsuperscript{280} Hoare touched on the need for the study of British antiquities as well as hinting at the importance of Wiltshire specifically and the reader can glean the pride in Wiltshire and Britain from Hoare’s volume.

The influence of the antiquarians was profound. As Colley pointed out, “Between 1750 and 1830 a wide spectrum of aspiring social groups and sectional interests throughout Britain found patriotic and nationalist language invaluable”\textsuperscript{281}. Antiquarians

\textsuperscript{278} Ibid, 1-4.
\textsuperscript{281} Colley, 117.
were one of these sectional interests and while Colley does not specifically mention them, they were influenced by the same set of social, economic, and cultural forces that Colley emphasized as influencing other non-ruling actors in the state. Patriotic and nationalist language infected the works of Hoare, Browne, Gibbon, and other members of the Society of Antiquaries and the various antiquity and numismatic societies that sprang up around Britain. The voice of nationalism found its way into academic work but it needed a spark, a spark that offered a narrative of antiquity different from Camden, Leland, and Milton, Stukeley offered that spark. Stukeley was not a nationalist writer but he allowed patriotism to influence his writings, writings continually reprinted and used as a guide for hundreds of years after his death.\textsuperscript{282} Browne who published his treatise on Stonehenge and Avebury in 1827, sixty-two years after Stukeley’s death, mentioned, “The opinion of Dr. Stukeley, as having obtained almost universal acceptance”, emphasized this.\textsuperscript{283} William Stukeley helped to foster interest in the pre-Roman antiquity of Britain and while he was inevitably wrong about many of his conclusions, the spirit of his work was no less poignant and important in influencing later antiquarians, nationalists, and archaeologists to focus on the wealth and understanding of Britain.

\textsuperscript{282} Harvey, 480.  
\textsuperscript{283} Browne, 5.
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